DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 329 312 JC 910 140

TITLE General Education: The Challenge of the 1990s. The Community College General Education Association Conference Proceedings (New York, New York, November 2-3, 1989).

INSTITUTION Community Coll. General Education Association, Utica, N.Y.

PUB DATE Nov 89

NOTE 94p.; Presentation by P. Colgate utilized overheads which are not included herein.

PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Business Education; *Community Colleges; *Core Curriculum; Critical Thinking; Curriculum Evaluation; Educational Development; Educational Philosophy; *Faculty Development; *General Education; Interdisciplinary Approach; Learning Theories; Liberal Arts; Minimum Competencies; Racial Factors; Role of Education; Sex Bias; Two Year Colleges; Two Year College Students; Writing Skills

ABSTRACT

This conference addressed the themes of faculty development in the liberal arts and business careers; class, race, ethnicity, and gender; the canon and conflict of change; and critical thinking, critical writing, and critical living. Following an introduction by Roberta S. Matthews, this collection of conference proceedings contains the following 18 presentations: (1) "General Education and the Community College," a keynote address by Gary E. Miller, with panel responses from Thomas Leemon, Larry Rushing and John Vasquez; (2) "Striking the Balance: A Funder's View of General Education," a keynote address by Alison Bernstein with panel responses from Audrey W. Harrigan, George Higginbottom and Marie Jean Lederman; (3) "An Archaeology of the Canon: A Liberal Artist Digs the Core," by John O. Stevenson, Jr.; (4) "Criteria for a Canon of Learning," by James P. Yess and John W. McCormack; (5) "Enriching the Culture of the Community College through the Humanities," by Evelyn Edson, Teresa Cook, Barbara MacCallum, James R. Perkins, and Kay Bethea; (6) "A 'Method Core' Curriculum," by Norah C. Chase; (7) "General Education and the Conflict of Change," by Pat Colgate; (8) "Class, Gender and Race: The Connecting Task of Narrative in General Education," by Kent Mitchell; (9) "General Education and the Social Delimitation of Class, Gender, Race and Ethnicity," by Richard V. Rapacz; (10) "Faculty Development: An Essential Component of a General Education Program," by Lenore R. Gall; (11) "The Role Model Problem in General Education," by Derek Harrison; (12) "Alternate Learning Structures to Strengthen General Education for Business Students," by Meryl Sussman; (13) "General Education as a Way Not to Pull the Leg of the Student Body," by Silvio Torres-Saillant; (14) "Interdisciplinary General Education at Daytona Beach Community College," by Fred Robbins; (15) "The Redbook Revisited: The Relationship of General Education to Issues of Excellence and Equity," by Evan S. Dobelle and Cal Kolbe; (16) " General Education and Critical Thinking: The Ostrich and Her Eggs," by Jane Ingalls and Nancy Bedford; (17) "The Non-Traditional Student, General Education and the Library Resources Center," by Ngozi Agbim; and (18) "The Image of the Other: Media Support for a Pluralistic Curriculum," by Louise Spain. (GFW)

ED329312

PROCEEDINGS

General Education: The Challenge Of The 1990s

Program

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Weintraub

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

The Community College General Education Association 10th Anniversary Conference at LaGuardia Community College/CUNY November 2-3, 1989

JC 910 140

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

Roberta S. Matthews, Associate Dean of Faculty, LaGuardia Community College CUNY 1

Keynote Speaker: Gary Miller, University of Maryland, author of The Meaning Of General Education: The Emergence Of A Curriculum Paradigm.
Philosophy is Not About Philosophy: Why We Teach General Education 1

Panel:
Thomas Leemon, Columbia Teachers College 5
Lawrence Rushing, LaGuardia Community College CUNY 7
John Vasquez, New York City Technical College CUNY 9

Keynote Speaker: Alison Bernstein, Program Officer, Ford Foundation. Director, Community College Initiative
Striking the Balance: A Funder's View of General Education 10

Panel:
Audrey Harrigan, LaGuardia Community College CUNY 16
George Higginbottom, Broome Community College SUNY 18
Marie Jean Lederman, Baruch College CUNY 20

An Archaeology of the Canon: a Liberal Artist Digs the Core
John Stevenson, LaGuardia Community College CUNY 22
Criteria for a Canon: Using the Veil of Ignorance
James P. Yess, Massasoit Community College, Massachusetts 26
Enriching the Culture of the Community College through the Humanities
Evelyn Edson, Kathryn Bethea, Teresa A. Cook, Barbara McCallum, Piedmont Virginia Community College, Virginia and 33
James D. Perkins, President, Blue Ridge Community College, Virginia 35
A 'Method Core' for Curriculum Norah Chase, Kingsborough Community College CUNY 37
General Education and The Conflict of Change Thomas Colgate, Chadron State College, Nebraska 40

Class, Gender and Race: The Connecting Task of Narrative in General Education
Kent Mitchell, Middlesex Community College, Massachusetts 48
Relationships Between General Education and the Social Factors of Class, Gender, Race and Ethnicity
Richard V. Rapacz, Massasoit Community College, Massachusetts 50
Faculty Development: An Essential Component of a General Education Program
Lenore R. Gall, Brooklyn College CUNY 54

The Role Model Problem in General Education
J. Derek Harrison, Monroe Community College, New York 58
Alternate Learning Structures to Strengthen General Education for Business Students
Meryl Sussman, LaGuardia Community College CUNY 64
General Education as a Way not to Pull the Leg of the Student Body
Silvio Torres-Saillant, Hostos Community College CUNY 67
Interdisciplinary General Education: The QUANTA Program at DBCC
Fred Robbins, Richard Zelley and Cindy Avens, Daytona Beach Community College, Florida 73

The Redbook Revisited: The Relationship Between General Education and Issues of Class, Gender and Race
Evan S. Dobelle, President, and Cal Kolbe, Middlesex Comm. College, Massachusetts 74
General Education and Critical Thinking: The Ostrich and Her Egg
Jane Ingalls and Nancy Bedford, Germanna Community College, Virginia 81
The non-traditional student, general education and the Library Resources Center
Ngozi Agbim, LaGuardia Community College CUNY 83
The Image of the Other: Media Support for a Pluralistic Curriculum
Louise Spain, LaGuardia Community College CUNY 86

INTRODUCTION

ROBERTA S. MATTHEWS, ASSOCIATE DEAN FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
LAGUARDIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

The 1989 CCGEA Conference, ***General Education: The Challenge of the 90s,*** addressed the following issues:

- Faculty Development In the Liberal Arts and Business Careers
- Class, Race, Ethnicity and Gender
- The Canon and the Conflict of Change
- Critical Thinking, Critical Writing, and Critical Living

This text reflects some of the good thinking and creative ideas that emerged as participants from over 30 institutions came together to rise to the challenge. In a time of social conflict and growing economic pressures, we need to create environments in higher education that provide a context for, in Robert Bellah's words, "conversations that matter." The CCGEA Conference offered such an environment. Recorded here is the formal dialogue of the conference; recorded in our minds are the numerous informal interchanges that will inform our work.

Our keynote speakers did what good keynote speakers should do--they started the dialogue -- setting the tone, announcing the themes and establishing the parameters for discussion. Gary Miller defined general education as those experiences which help students find meaning in their lives. He focused our attention on what is gained by the active application of learning, and explored the special position and role of the community college. Alison Bernstein shared her "4 Cs" of general education: common culture, competence, coherence, and citizenship noting that general education expresses the values and goals of a particular institution. How students search for the meaning in their lives, how educational institutions search for ways of expressing their meaning and how the two relate, were themes that reverberated throughout the conference.

One way of making meaning in education is to help students incorporate into the narrative of their own lives the educational experiences of the institution. To do this there needs to be college-wide understanding of the ends and assumptions of a given general education program. If a significant goal of general education is to help students navigate diverse academic cultures, perhaps we--faculty, staff and administrators -- need to become general education role models for our students. As one speaker noted, we may need to redefine ourselves before we can help our students see themselves differently.

Through thoughtful explorations of the meaning of the canon we grappled with what general education means for our students in our time. One speaker suggested changing general education from a quarrel over essential facts and concepts to a celebration and exploration of different ways of knowing, thinking, teaching and learning. Citing the many undemocratic implications and assumptions of traditional education, one speaker suggested that general education is an institutional expression of "what it means to be a college-educated person;" a goal of education, then, must be to empower the individual student. Essentially, there was a call for integrative humane education so that our students possess the skills and abilities needed to function in an increasingly complex and interlocking environment.

We reviewed models of successful programs that addressed issues of community and enriched the general education of students. We considered the rigors and joys of faculty enrichment programs, the development of learning communities and an exploration of the particular role and position of community colleges in relation to general education. As one speaker noted, general education in the community college "is a new game with new rules," to meet the needs, aspirations and talents of our particular student populations. We learned about media resources for incorporating race,

gender and class into more traditional subject matters. Strategies for change were practical and based on what we have been doing at our home institutions.

Many people worked on this conference and contributed to its success. As with most endeavors, dedicated commitment is necessary in order to put all the pieces in place. Those who helped create this conference are listed on the final page. I would especially like to thank John Appiah, a lecturer in LaGuardia's Department of Office Technology who formatted and input these ***Proceedings***. The task was more time-consuming than we anticipated and John met this particular challenge with unflappable good humor and a high level of professionalism. We are all grateful to him for allowing us to read the conversation of our conference.

GENERAL EDUCATION AND THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

GARY E. MILLER, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

Tonight, I would like to talk with you about general education and its role in the community college. As we all know, general education is much in the news these days, but nevertheless, it still suffers from poor definition, loose rhetoric, and what some people have called "interpretive drift." That is to say, we all bring our own assumptions and personal definitions to the term "general education," and we rarely discuss these assumptions in order to make sure that we are really talking about the same thing. As a result, I'm sure you have all experienced situations in which a committee meets, talks about general education, sets goals for general education, and makes decisions: these are the objectives of general education for this college and here is how we will reach those objectives. Then, somehow, as we all go back to our departments, things change; our interpretation of the objectives and plan begins to drift away from what we thought were the commonly held assumptions. It turns out that we never really had agreement about basic assumptions and definition of terms. As a result, the plan itself never quite achieves what it was supposed to achieve. It is as if we all agreed to play a game, but I define it as baseball, you define it as football, and someone in another department defines it as basketball. We're all playing, but no one is scoring. Least of all the student.

The need to define our fundamental assumptions with regard to general education is crucial, I believe. And so I would like to spend a fair amount of my time tonight defining terms so that, by the time we are done, we will know not only whether or not we agree, but why. Then, the practical work of building a workable general education curriculum can begin.

A few weeks ago, I was in Geneva, New York, talking about general education with faculty at Hobart and William Smith Colleges. While I was there, I visited the campus book store and picked up a book called ***The Philosophy of History*** by John William Miller, no relation. What prompted me to plop down $6.50 for this book was the second sentence of the first essay. The essay was entitled "The Utility of Historical Study" (in other words, "Why bother to study history?"), and the second sentence read, "The most important factor in learning is the ability to say what one's experience was about."

> THE MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR IN LEARNING IS THE ABILITY TO SAY WHAT ONE'S EXPERIENCE WAS ABOUT.

Why is this a $6.50 sentence? Well, to me, several of the basic issues of general education are embedded right in that sentence. It is a good touchstone for general education. If we accept the idea that learning is an experience, then at the end of each learning experience, we should be able to ask "What was that experience about?" "What meaning did that experience have?" Moreover, we should be able to answer those questions in very specific and practical ways.

The first thing that we must always keep in mind about general education is that it is about ***learning.*** That may sound like an obvious and simple statement, but let's look at the assumptions that I bring to the word. First, and most important, learning is not teaching. Teaching is what we do. Learning is what the student does. General education should be student-centered. It should be concerned with the meaning that the student attaches to whatever it is we are teaching--with how the student makes sense of the material being studied. If you agree, as I do, with John Dewey's view that the means of education must be consistent with the ends, saying that general education is learning-oriented has enormous implications for structure, content, and methods of the curriculum.

Let's go back to John Miller's second sentence just a minute: "The most important factor in learning is the ability to say what one's experience is about." If general education is primarily concerned with learning, it is equally concerned with ***experience.*** This is not to say that knowledge has no role in education, nor is it to say that experience is an end in itself. In general

education, neither knowledge nor experience is an end in itself. The purpose of learning is to find ***meaning*** in experience. Finding meaning--being able to say what one's experience was about--is ultimately the goal of a general education curriculum.

Here, I think, we come to the crux of the problem facing many of us who are interested in general education reform. Most of us see two broad problems facing American society. One problem is the one that has come to be labeled "cultural illiteracy." The concern, ultimately, is that we are losing our sense of the past and, with it, the best of our civilization. It is a significant issue, but one for which it is difficult to know that we have the proper perspective. The task of defining just what knowledge--and what kinds of learning--are central to the maintenance of our culture is a daunting one. It is especially daunting if one asks seriously what it is that we should preserve. Is the task to preserve the past or to preserve the cultural momentum upon which the future is created? If there is a balance, where is it to be found? The other problem is equally important. It is perhaps best described as a loss of connection between the individual and his or her environment. This includes the inability to define our values, the inability to solve problems or make decisions that take into account the broad interests of the various communities in which we live--our families, our peers at work, our neighborhood and town, and our world itself. These are the issues to which general education is directed. The fact that these issues have reached crisis proportions in our society is exactly why general education reform is so important today and why 95 percent of our colleges and universities are trying to tackle the issue in one way or another.

Here is where the need for definition comes to the fore, for it is here that interpretive drift is most likely to occur. It is also here where it is important to keep in mind that general education is concerned primarily with learning and with experience than with teaching and with knowledge. General education is concerned with the student and the student's ability to make sense of his or her experience as a citizen, as a worker, as a member of a family, and as an individual. The goals, the methods, and the subject matter of general education must all be evaluated on this criterion.

A few weeks ago, Lynne Chaney of the National Endowment for the Humanities released a proposal for a 50-hour core curriculum, her response to the general education issue. The curriculum is largely addressed to the problem of cultural illiteracy that I mentioned earlier. But I maintain that it fails as general education. The reason is that the NEH core curriculum directly addresses ***only*** the first problem. The purpose it serves is to give students exposure to the traditions of Western Civilization. But, in its concern for ensuring that students are exposed to knowledge and in its treatment of knowledge as an end in itself, the NEH curriculum overlooks the need to put that knowledge to work, to use knowledge as a tool for helping students make sense of their own experience. This cannot be seen as simply a byproduct of knowledge. It is the ***primary*** goal of general education.

Where, then, does subject matter come into the curriculum? What role does knowledge play in general education? This, too, is where many curricula fail. By not defining the goals completely and thus not defining where subject matter fits in, the tendency is often simply to fall back on "breadth and depth" and on the idea that exposing a student to information achieves the goal. To get a handle on this issue, let me go back to John William Miller, and this time to the first sentence of his essay, keeping in mind that the essay was not about education, but about the utility of studying history. He started this way. "History," he said, "is one of the modes of learning from experiences." Here is the linkage between knowledge and experience that is most relevant to general education. In John Miller's view, history is not ***about*** history; it is about making sense of a particular kind of human experience. Philosophy, in the same sense, is not about philosophy; it is about the struggle to live in a way that is ethical and just. There is a difference between learning something and learning ***about*** something. The meaning of general education rests in that difference.

The key to general education is not necessarily ***what*** we teach. If that was the case, then knowledge ***would*** be an end in itself for general education. What is most important is that, first, we select subject matter for its ability to inform experience, and, second, that we present it--that we teach--in a way that makes that knowledge useful to helping the student find meaning in

experience. What we teach and how we teach must be in line with why we teach: to help students learn, to help them make sense of their experience in life. It should also prepare them to act on the meaning that they discover. It is not the knowledge that is important, ultimately. It is the ability of the student to learn, the ability of the student to seek out knowledge and to use knowledge to make decisions, solve problems, find values, make sense of the world. But, again, we cannot assume that all this will come just because we have exposed the student to the history of western civilization or to the ideas contained in the great books. These must be seen as tools for learning rather than as ends in themselves.

These three, closely related concepts are central to the definition of a general education program. Concept one: general education is concerned with learning rather than teaching; that is, it is concerned how the student interacts with information and activities. Concept two: general education is concerned with meaning; that is, the instructional goal is not the acquisition of knowledge, but the use of knowledge. Concept three, general education is concerned with experience; that implies that it is concerned with immediate, local issues and with the future more than the past.

The Role of the Community College

That said, why is the issue of general education an especially important one for community colleges? There are several reasons.

Certainly the most obvious and important of these is the mission of the community college. Of all the institutions of higher education in American life, the community college is most directly linked to the immediate needs of a specific, local community. The relationships among the institution, its students, and the community they share is basic to the mission of the college. The approach to general education that I have just described is a natural extension--or, more properly, a fulfillment--of that mission. A community college general education program can use the community as the basis for a shared experience, a laboratory for testing the relevance of subject matter and for helping the student make sense of his or her experience as a member of that community.

Second, community colleges are blessed with a large percentage of part-time students, students who are already active as workers, heads of families, and active participants in their communities. These students, who regardless of the age are functioning adults, are especially read for a curriculum that is not separate from their daily experience but that establishes lines of understanding between their daily lives and college subject matter. This is much more relevant to them than the traditional distribution curriculum which gives students an introduction to many different academic professions. Here, the distinction between learning and teaching must be seen as critical.

Finally, community colleges are concerned more with teaching (and learning) than with research. Many of the problems with today's curriculum rest with the tension between teaching and research, the fragmentation of the academic process into narrow disciplines, for instance, is a direct result of increasingly specialized research. The distribution approach to general education, in turn, reflects the results of that fragmentation on the instructional process. Community colleges need not follow suit. There is no reason for the academic resources of a community college to be organized around research interests, when they could be organized around learning interests.

First Steps

What needs to happen for general education to be successful in a community college setting? Obviously, lots of things are important, but I would like to emphasize three. However, before I do that, let me also emphasize that there is no one general education curriculum. Each college should design a program that speaks best to the learning needs of its particular students and to the local environment. In some cases, it may be that an adaptation of a western civilization's

approach (one that uses the past as case study for helping students understand their own experience and culture, rather than as an end in itself) would be most appropriate. In others, a more experimental, experiential learning might work better.

With that in mind, the first thing that one needs is for everyone on the campus to share the same rhetoric. Define your terms and use your definitions to test your assumptions about the curriculum throughout its development. Unless you do this, no long-term gain will be made. Along with this is the need to ***communicate*** the goals and methods of the curriculum so that everyone--especially the students--understands it completely. Unless the students know why they are learning, they are not likely to learn effectively.

Second, and equally important, invest in faculty development not just at the beginning of the process, but throughout it. Ultimately, your general education curriculum is no more or less than what your faculty do in the classroom. It is useful to remember that few of us have been through general education programs themselves. Our graduate degrees are evidence of our own experience with a research-based, discipline-ordered education that is quite different from general education.

The best way to look at the role of faculty development in general education is to see it as integral to the entire curriculum. Ultimately, the purpose of faculty development is to create and maintain the ***means and methods*** of the curriculum. Those methods may change over time as the goals and objectives of the program mature. However, unless the goals and objectives are accompanied by methods that are consistent with the goals of the curriculum, nothing will be accomplished. Ongoing faculty development is the key to ensuring that the means of the curriculum matches the goals of the curriculum.

Finally, the curriculum should undergo regular, thorough evaluation to be sure that each course--and the curriculum in general--is meeting the objectives, that the means are consistent with the ends, and that innovation has not calcified into doctrine. This should involve students and, ideally, it should continue to involve students several years after they have graduated from the program.

Final Words

One final word about general education. General education is supposed to be ***comprehensive.*** By that I do not mean that it covers all knowledge in one large survey (even faculty within the disciplines are having trouble with that issue right now). Instead, I mean that it should permeate the entire curriculum and even the extra-curriculum--the social and public service programs--of the institution. Some institutions, for instance, are extending general education concepts into the "majors" by including courses on professional ethics or on social issues that relate to a particular vocation or profession.

I bring this up because I think it is important for community colleges to think about general education as being central to the mission of the college, as being the primary way that the college articulates its relationship to students and to the community itself.

Thank you.

RESPONDENT TO GARY MILLER

THOMAS LEEMON, COLUMBIA TEACHERS COLLEGE

It is always a pleasure to be invited to an intellectual journey under the guidance of a traveller familiar with the important aspects of the region and with one who is willing to share his or her expertise with you. Dr. Miller's paper illuminates some aspects of general education that caused me to reflect upon some of the problems with the attainment of agreement in the academic community about the goals, organization, and implementation of a general education component in the undergraduate curriculum. The things I want to mention briefly about this predicament are what I will label the "problematic".

The *first* of the problematics surrounding general education is the notion that general education programs are elitist. The fact of the matter is that they are egalitarian.

General education programs, if they are conceived responsibly, enfranchise, provide access, and introduce students to the social and intellectual values, ideas, and institutions that,a when understood, empower the individual and clarify the interrelationship of the individual and the society. Those experiences provide the foundation for a complex sense of identity and furnish the student with the sense and responsibility of being an active participant in experiences as a conscious and free person. All of this starts with verbal competency and mastery of language.

General education goal statements frequently sound culture based and, therefore, lacking in instrumental use. Actually, they are not elitist, but are statements of minimum standards that we and our students should expect and tolerate. While these goal statements reflect minimum levels expected, to commit ourselves to less would signal that we are patronizing our students, saying they don't matter, and we're not going to insist upon and provide a comprehensive and quality education that the confluence of general and specialized education provide when viewed in combination.

The *second* of the problematics facing those who are attempting to improve general education programs is the notion that general education can be discussed in a comprehensive way without discussing teaching. If general education provides one avenue for consciousness about and interpretation of past, present, and anticipated experience, then students must have experiences in being actively engaged in learning about and discovering the shared cultural bases for managing the meaning of experience and the creation of experience. All of this suggests that general education cannot be learned as a passive experience, and it cannot be taught using classroom management strategies that encourage passive learning, reliance solely upon lecture, virtually no reading, less writing, and multiple-choice tests. General education and its meaning for the experience of our students must be realized actively and creatively. Just covering the material will not be enough. Those goals will require that professors pay attention to reinforcing the leaning skills our students need (reading, writing, speaking, and listening, among others) or our students will not be able to master the content of the course. In fact, in some institutions, the acquisition of and use of language and learning skill *is* the general education program. That goal is culture based and practical. Without those skills all the rest of higher education is inaccessible... and so is a considerable portion of experience outside of colleges and universities.

The *final* problem related to general education that faculties have to confront is that there is not, in many places, anything close to agreement about the goals and values of general education, much less the particular configuration those programs can take. Some portion of the faculty have not experienced general education in their own undergraduate educations. Further, the graduate education of the faculty has placed particular value on specialization, quite appropriately. For about twenty years now (a time period when many of you were educated in college) general education programs have been in a state of confusion (there are exceptions) because faculties were more interested in their specialization or because they had lost their will to define the educational programs of their institutions because it required that they respond to critics (mainly students)

who told them that clients or consumers should have the final say about what courses they would take in order to be awarded a degree. What we encouraged was the idea that the faculty had no idea about what was relevant and that democratization of the curriculum, or that did not challenge students, or that was simply confirmatory (made them feel good and, maybe as a by-product, competent). The result was that we fostered the idea that a certain level of cultural and academic ineptness would lead to liberation.

What a mistake that was. Now we have almost lost the language that is necessary to talk about general education programs in our colleges. All of you who have worked on academic affairs or curriculum committees know that.

I am very challenged by Professor Miller's emphasis in his definition of general education: assisting students to find meaning in their own experience and preparing them to act, and I can accept that proposition and work with it. The way I understand it, I think the problem becomes now what is that experience of the students we're talking bout and then, what does it mean to act on it? I'd like to address this in terms of the students that attend CUNY University and the CUNY Community Colleges. I think that it quite possibly could be a different experience. It may be one thing when experience conforms, let's say, to the mainstream and the status quo, and I think it might be another thing when experience is the experience of people who are still oppressed and belong to racial and ethnic casts. So when we speak of students at the community colleges, I think that we have to talk about the majority are racial and ethnic minorities and women. I think we have to talk about a certain reality.

Part of that reality is that we have to deal with certain statistics like this: that we're in New York City, where about 38% of the children live in poverty and where let's say about one half of the largest Hispanic ethnic group, Puerto Ricans, live in poverty with an average income of about 10,000 per year as opposed to the average income of about $31,000 a year. The fact that the majority of the Black children born in this city, are born to unmarried couples. The majority of Black children live in poverty. We're dealing with a situation where the income of Black men, say between the ages 20-24, has been cut in half over the past ten years, where homicide is a leading cause of death among young Black males, where it's more likely that they might wind up in prison than that they would attend a college, and where the discussion of extinction of the Black males in society today is something that has to be taken seriously.

So what we're dealing with is an average Black community that is under siege, where it's quickly being destroyed by crime, drugs, AIDS, violence, alienation, and despair, where the life expectancy among Black people is actually going down. We're dealing with a situation where even let's say, in the job market today, in a study of 193 different industries in New York City, Blacks and Hispanics are virtually excluded from 130 of the 193. Where investigators of housing segregation are shocked by finding that it's far more pervasive than they thought, and that it is growing. Finally, recent research—the most extensive study of Black Americans since Murdal's American Dilemma, — a study by the National Research Council costs 2.7 million dollars, which says that "full integration of Blacks into our color-blind society is unlikely in any foreseeable future."

Now, given this, what are we talking about when we say we're going to examine the experience of the student population at CUNY? What does this mean then in terms of general education, if we're going to take this matter seriously? There are a few points that I would like to make, that I think follow from this.

One is that we can't deal with this reality of general education unless we are willing, ourselves, to deal with the reality of Black life and the life of people of color in American society. And as I see it, that's one of the things we have failed to do. If we can't deal with Bensonhurst and Howard Beach, we can't design general education for our student population. We have to deal with it, we have to deal with the fact that in our society there have been deliberate policies on the part of some people with power to exclude a lot of people of color from their rightful place in our society. This has to be part of the starting point of any kind of general education program for our student population. We're talking about their lives and how we're going to act on those lives.

A second point is that we ourselves have to immerse ourselves in the culture of our students, that if we're going to have this type of dialogue, with our students (that we've heard and discussed here this evening) then we have to come to terms with that reality ourselves. And we start off with students who have been damaged by that system and have not have had that experience. So,

schools in American teach Blacks and people of color, a white-wash version of history that teaches them to be ashamed of themselves and to feel inferior to white people in this society. I have never met yet a Black student in my classes, who hasn't been damaged by the education they've undergone. And the problem is this, that we here, say at LaGuardia, either through co-mission or omission, are not addressing the issue. We are not filling in and doing the things that we ought to be doing.

Finally, we need to center general education now, around the history, culture and present predicament, of the students that we serve. It is not for us to impose our reality on them; but it is their reality we must get to know and we must then deal with our students and have them come to appreciate themselves just as truly human as any people and as capable of overcoming the unjust obstacles placed in their path to a better life. I think what I'm getting down to is, the education of an oppressed minority here, has to be able to deal with the guest of this population for greater freedom and justice for themselves and for their people and for the world in which they live.

And I think, in fact, that this would be a worthy goal, not just for minority students, but would be a worthy goal for all students in our society.

RESPONDENT TO GARY MILLER

JOHN VASQUEZ, NEW YORK CITY TECHNICAL COLLEGE, CUNY

Professor Vasquez commented that in teaching general education to a multicultural, multilingual student population the educator must be eclectic. This type of non-traditional student population leads us to create several general education paradigms. However, it seems to me that Dr. Miller's emphasis on the students and their making sense of their own experiences is key in general education. The educator must serve as facilitator, role model, and socializing agent. A teacher's role is not primarily to teach or instruct, but to share, awaken and, through a meaningful process, sensitize the students to its past, present, and potential future experiences. When I discuss social organization or social structure with my students, I ask them about their neighborhoods or their roles in the family, church, or school. In discussing the process of socialization, I frequently ask them to discuss their self-image and how they experience early childhood or adolescence. This clearly refers to Dr. Miller's comments on how knowledge is to be used as a "tool for helping the student make sense of their own experiences." This clearly refers to Dr. Miller's comments on how knowledge is to be used as a "tool for helping the student make sense of their own experiences." I strongly agree that content (knowledge) is to be used to alert and involve the student in finding meaning to experiences. General education facilitates the clarification of values, enhances virtues, and develops citizenship, regardless of race, ethnicity, or gender. It seems to me that race, color, ethnicity, gender, and poverty play a role in the student's development, however, it is general education that allows us to express our feelings and permits us to articulate, better understand, and act on whatever our present situation is.

I contend that cultural illiteracy is only relatively a problem because we are exposed and involved in cultural literacy every day as educators and active classroom teachers. As for the loss of connection between the individual and his environment, I fail to see this as a problem today. If our students are allowed leeway in their oral and written communications, they will and frequently do reveal sensitivity and keen awareness of their surroundings. When I teach Urban Sociology or Race and Ethnic Relations, the students select and write, as well as discuss, current critical issues, such as the homeless, crime, especially crack and racial tensions in America and in New York City. I share and agree with Dr. Miller's operational definition of general education. After more than 20 years teaching general education courses, I know that general education facilitates the student's articulation and that this is encouraged when the instructor facilitates as though the student matters. A process oriented, student centered, pedagogical disposition is supportive, conducive, and energizes the learning activity.

At New York City Technical College, we serve a multicultural, multilingual, multiethnic student population. Our general education curriculum uses process and content in providing the student with an education and experiences that will lead to life-long learning. In a relative, limited sense, we share Dr. Miller's operational definition of general education. I also agree that we must continuously evaluate what we are doing in the general education curriculum. We must continue to emphasize process and student-centeredness.

STRIKING THE BALANCE: A FUNDER'S VIEW OF GENERAL EDUCATION

KEYNOTE SPEAKER: *ALISON BERNSTEIN, PROGRAM OFFICER, FORD FOUNDATION. DIRECTOR, COMMUNITY COLLEGE INITIATIVE*

The topic that brings us together here this morning is one that funders love to talk about. Perhaps that's because we're such generalist ourselves and claim a certain perspective based on breath of experience as opposed to depth of knowledge in a certain field.

When I was asked if I'd be willing to address this topic this morning, I didn't hesitate. And yet, as I prepared my remarks, I had the distinct feeling that I had jumped feet first into a "quagmire" of gooey language and rhetoric about the goals and purposes of general education. Consider for example, the first paragraph of a recent A.A.C. report called, "A New Vitality In General Education" -- that was brought to you by those funders who love to talk about general education by Exxon and the Johnson Foundation.

Here's the topic paragraph: "We define general education as the cultivation of the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that all of us use and live by during most of our lives, whether as parents, as citizens, as lovers, as travelers, as participants in the arts, leaders, volunteers, or good samaritans." That's the paragraph. It doesn't leave out much.

Who can quarrel with that kind of definition, yet who among us can offer a general education program that could make good on any of these outcomes? As I grow older, I become more satisfied with what I would call measurable steps to larger, more ambitious destinations.

So let's start with my definition. It's not necessarily the definition brought to us by those funders (some of whom are good friends of mine).

My definition of general education is practical and more functional. General education is the name typically given to the core of undergraduate studies outside the major field, and more particularly, that portion of the curriculum studied by all students regardless of the major or their intended career or specialization. Now for argument's sake, I'll define this definition even more by eliminating electives.

According to a recent study that's mentioned in a recent issue of ***Change*** Magazine conducted at Penn State, the definition I gave you, means that approximately 37% of all B. A. Degree work is in general education.

Some of you who like statistics even in a general education speech, will know that this figure is up 4.5% since 1974, but it's still well below the 43% required in 1967 when I was an undergraduate in college. Thirty-seven percent of degree credits of the typical Baccalaureate. By the way, these figures are for four-year institutions. How do we interpret them for the two-year colleges? Do we have them? Most general education catalog requirements, at the community college level, suggest somewhere between 18 and 30 credit hours depending upon whether a student is in an A. A. program, an A. S. program or an A. A. S. program.

In general, I would say that less than 33% of the total credit hours needed to graduate with an Associate Degree is focused on general education.

Well, why do funders care so much about this little piece of "turf"? You'll get many answers from different funders. I want to give you mine. General education isn't the functional definition. It's still the best mirror we have, the singular mirror we have of the intellectual, moral, and cultural values of an institution. It's the institution's best and most explicit expression of what it means to be a college student, to be a person .

The major, on the other hand, expresses what the faculty thinks is the specialized knowledge needed to gain mastery at the undergraduate level in the field. But it's not the expression of what it means to be a college-educated person.

Funders who think that putting a college experience within reach of all those who care to have the college experience, and have the potential and the aspiration to benefit from it, obviously also care about general education very much.

At the federal level, the two funding sources that come to mind are FIPSE and NEH. In private philanthropy the Exxon Education Foundation is the only funding source with a specific program on general education. But, Ford focuses on it in two ways. First through its transfer work and even more broadly, by efforts to mainstream (that's our term; other people might say transform) curriculum at the undergraduate level to incorporate certain teachings in a pluralistic sense on minorities and women.

The Mellon Foundation gives faculty development grants which could be for general education reform. But neither Mellon nor Rockefeller Foundation are focused, exclusively or even primarily, on undergraduate curriculum and undergraduate curriculum reform.

Nevertheless, there's a lot of funding action in the field of general education and this action has at least, a twenty-year old history. Over the past two decades funders have played a role, either directly or indirectly, in movements to reform general education.

In the 1960's, cries for relevance in the curriculum led to the development of new inter-disciplinary fields such as urban, women, black studies, environmental studies, and Native American studies. Many of these fields emerged from funding from NEH, Ford and sometimes, from Mellon.

These fields in turn influenced general education and they challenged traditional distribution requirements and general education courses. Notice I said challenged because my impression is that not much has changed. For example, at Columbia University, where I did my graduate work, they only recently introduced a single woman author, Jane Austen. Jane Austen entered the Core-Humanities course and it was a three-year battle until they finally arrived at Jane Austen.

In the 1970's, the decade that I was at FIPSE, two themes emerged in higher education reform that helped to reshape general education programs. These themes (there were others but these are the ones I think had the most profound effect on general education), were competency-based assessment and career education. Both in my judgment, undercut the notion that general education is simply the determination of a specific content. Competency led general education reformers into new territories which incorporated developmental skills at college level work as part of the goal of general education. Career education raised John Dewey-like questions about the relationship of theoretical learning to experienced-based learning.

Both competency-driven models and career-oriented models have the effect, I think, unintended, but nevertheless, the consequence of pushing aside curriculum that seem to have more abstract purposes without immediate vocational or identifiable utilities. Now we're into the 1980's and we witnessed a renewed interest among funders which means a renewed interest among colleges and universities in redefining and strengthening the general education component of undergraduate studies. Well, why this renewed interest? That brings us back to some funders again. The funders I think you probably recognize, the most important which is the National Endowment For Humanities. I actually have the terminology which I hope doesn't get me into too much trouble. I called it "The Three Wise Men Of The West." They are Bennett, Bloom, and Hirsch. You have to understand that Bennett was the funder but Bloom and Hirsch were the recipients. It is very important that these three wise men shaped the debate in the early 1970's over general education. It's important to understand the "critique" of the three wise men of the west.

Their first critique was that general education lacked coherence. Their second was that it paid insufficient attention to the "great" books and the lasting legacies of Western Civilization. The third was, even if they paid insufficient attention to Western Civilization, they also were not sufficiently interested in international issues. Especially, for example, language studies. Lastly, they were not particularly reflective of the technological and scientific revolution of the late 20th century.

Now, I poked a little fun at these three guys, but I think their critiques had their usefulness. They implied that we were making some progress. In other words, backlashes do prove that you are not being ignored and that you are having some effect. In a weak moment I will admit to some sympathy for the argument, that a lot of the rhetoric of the 1970's, the rhetoric that I, FIPSE and others really encouraged, sounded and was overly process-oriented. One does not teach content through skills, one writes about something; not all experiential learning leads intellectually to learning gains.

As one colleague of mine pointed out recently, "You can learn many things over a ten year period or the same thing repeated ten times over." To some extent, the reforms of the 1970's over-emphasized the learning process and individualization at the expense of common goals. It seems as if a college could not require common learning of all its students. The problems of the 1970's, in effect, were the mirror image of the problems we now have with Bennett, Bloom, and Hirsch's overemphasis on content. As a result, general education ends up ricoshaying between these; contentlessness and process, and content and coherence. Therefore, we get to the title of my remarks, "How Do We Strike The Balance?" There are multiple purposes of general education, LaGuardia has found ten. "A New Integrity in the Core Curriculum" notes nine different goals for general education. For the purpose of this meeting, I'm going to confine myself to four, and we can debate whether four are too many or too few.

The four categories I think characterize the best of general education involves four purposes. The first (actually, for those of you in the English profession, they are my four C's as opposed to the three C's) the four C's of general education. The first: general education exists to transmit a common culture. I choose the word "common" not "core" and we can debate that, a common culture. General education intends to ensure college level competency. General education strives for coherence in the face of the increasing fragmentation and specialization of knowledge and lastly; general education helps prepare students and aid students for effective citizenship.

Culture, competence, coherence, and citizenship. Those are the four purposes and categories that I will define as constituting a strong general education program.

Now, the best general education strikes a balance among these four purposes and in general, all of us have not done a very good job to arrive at this balancing act, especially, given our particular institutional climates and setups. In the time that remains let me elaborate this point again by an over-simplification and through the use of case studies. I hope you will forgive me because I had a lot of fun with these. They may sound familiar and they may not. We'll see. I apologize to the panel because they got the notion that I was going to do case studies, but they didn't know what was decided.

Let's briefly look at the current state of general education at four distinct institutions, that I believe, stand in for many similar ones across the country.

Our first institution, I called Imperial University. At Imperial University, a large research-oriented flagship university somewhere in the mid-west, general education is largely a set of distributional requirements. It's composed of introductions and sampling disciplines. It's the Kellogg's variety pack approach to general education. And it's based on the premise that one cannot possibly learn everything one needs to know, so why make pretense about coherence or about general education? If students learn a skill here, a skill there, or competence along the way, and pick up a desirable attitude like tolerance, so much the better. But that's gravy. That's not general education. At Imperial University, general education is a sampling technique. It lacks

coherence but exposes a lot of content. It's a bureaucratic requirement that introduces students to their eventual majors, but it is not a program. Imperial University: case study number one.

Now let's look at another case study, number two. This case study is about Simple State Colleges somewhere in the northeast. Simple State would love to emulate the general education effort at Imperial University. We all know that, but there are enough people at Simple State, enough educators, I would say, on the faculty, a very perjorative term. By the way, it used to be a teacher education institution, so there are a lot of women on the faculty. Since 1970 it has become a comprehensive university. It's not quite satisfied with Imperial University's sampling approach. It's also a teaching institute, primarily, so disciplinary research, while important, doesn't entirely run the institution's value system. Simple State, therefore, has tried to combine distribution requirements (which I call the sampling method) with competency outcomes. This results in one kind of common curriculum, and it is a curriculum largely designed to prepare students for taking a rising junior test in reading, writing and in mathematics. That's the one experience every student at Simple State gets. Maybe or maybe not, physical education might be another one.

Why is competency so important at Simple State? The answer is simple. The legislature has become the educational policy committee of the institution. Needless to say, there is an old guard at Simple State, that yearns for the old days before rising junior exams and legislative interference. They identify, as Bloom, Hirsch and Bennett do, with the great books and the life of the mind. So they have gotten a few Western Civilization courses pushed into the general education requirement in recent years, but for every new course they have added, women studies and minorities studies faculty have countered with a required gender and race course requirement of their own at Simple State. Simple State has thus, fashioned a general education program as an effort to provide something for everybody.

Now let's turn to case study number three. And I call that institution Ivy College, better known as IVY, since it is so well known and using the word college is a redundancy. At Ivy, we are in a proverbial state of curricular wars over general education and the core curricula. Interestingly enough, it is Ivy's students who keep the battle fired up and use all the military metaphors. What is the canon? Can we infiltrate enemy lines by replacing Shakespeare with Alice Walker? As if that was the only choice. At Ivy, there is not much talk about general education for the purpose of assuring confidence or coherence or citizenship. Instead, the debate rages about the transmission of a core culture. Not necessarily a common culture. Whose culture asks the students and the battle participants? What's common to all? Everyone is trying to capture this precious piece of **turf**, the 37% of the total degree credits in the institution, this precious piece of **turf** which I now believe is the Hiroshima of undergraduate curriculum. There are periodic cease fires as a truce emerges, but it doesn't last very long. Especially since several other groups, often student-led, have not had an opportunity to assert their claims upon their curriculum, such as Marxist studies or gay studies.

Ivy College battles get a lot of attention from the press mostly because many of their graduates work at the press. But relatively few students are affected by what happens at Ivy.

Now let me turn finally to Transfer Tech, our first case study in the community college sector. I have chosen this oxymoronic title deliberately-Transfer Tech-because this is an institution struggling to define general education for a student population that is, by traditional criteria both terminal and transfer-oriented. Sometimes Transfer Tech solves the problem simply by aping the general education requirements of Simple State and sometimes it says to Hell with the question of reconciling general education here with general education there. After all, Simple State doesn't have the perfect model either. Thus, general education and Transfer Tech is often an externally designed program; either defined by the four-year college which is calling a certain tune, or by the demands of the vocational programs that are in fact responding to tunes that are being called from outside Transfer Tech. In either case, there is hardly time to debate the so-called canon, and who got shot out of it.

There's a little more attention to competency at Transfer Tech because of the need to assure students that if they can actually transfer to an upper division course, they have a chance of completing the baccalaureate. Coherence is harder to identify since at its best general education at Transfer Tech is a conglomerate of courses not necessarily a sampling like Imperial University. It's more like a smattering of related fields like Humanities 101 or Social Science 101.

Given the fact that most students would not select a Humanities course as an elective, it seems the right thing to do to require it. At least once in their experience at Transfer Tech. Students will be required to look at a slide of art or listen to music written before 1985. Unlike Imperial University, which seems happy enough with its solution to general education, and Ivy, which is in constant turmoil, and Simple State, which is always anxious about losing ground to the legislative curriculum planning, Transfer Tech is perplexed.

Students do not seem to be troubled by the state of affairs but the faculty is increasingly uneasy. In fact, a major reform just passed a curriculum committee at Transfer Tech--a common English Composition course for Business Administration majors and Business Management majors (by the way, two different tracks at Transfer Tech. Business Administration is the transfer degree and Business Management is the so called terminal degree). A major reform just passed when everyone agreed to abolish the English Composition for Business Administration and the English Composition for Business Management and replace those courses with one course. Major, major success. The English Composition course now will be required of all students regardless of their tracks. But, it is still not clear what the writing assignment will look like or what writers will be studied but at least the faculty has struck a note of coherence.

Well, so much for the current state of general education at our four case study institutions. What conclusions can we and should we draw from these obviously over-blown, over-exaggerated (but I hope a bit funny) case studies? Let me suggest three suggested conclusions.

First, fashioning a strong general education program requires keeping at least the four C's in one's head simultaneously. Culture, confidence, coherence and citizenship. The program may not weigh all four equally.

For example, Ivy and Imperial may be able to ignore "competence" given the kind of selectivity and elitism which they practice in admissions. They might even say (if some of them are really honest), they can't afford to ignore competence but they certainly cannot issues of citizenship and coherence and common culture.

Secondly, general education is to be fashioned with an eye towards where you want students to end up, not where they begin. As individuals, students come to our institutions with certain deep levels of preparation and shallow levels of preparation. It is important to start where they start, but it's also important that general education end up somewhere else.

These students are individuals and need to be provided an education that matches their individual needs. But they're also members of overlapping, and at the same time, distinct communities.

I must share with you that I've done a little work reviewing E. D. Hirsch's book and arguments. I wrote an editorial in ***Change*** not long ago on the subject and I admit a little sympathy for E. D. Hirsch. I don't put him in the same camp as Bill Bennett. And the reason I admit this sympathy is because E. D. Hirsch is basically a "Tory". He's not a neo-conservative. He's a Tory. and a Tory, for those who know British History, really believes in tradition, and they even believe that all of us who don't have that tradition ought to have it. So when he says, "Everyone needs to know Shakespeare", he wants everybody to know Shakespeare. I think that's different from Bill Bennett. I don't think that Bill Bennett is sure we all should know that.

Now for me, the question in the second conclusion is, Where do you want students to end up? Not as lovers, parents (although that would be nice), but as graduates of our college.

And number three and my last observation is no matter how you cut this question of general education reform, the people who bear the responsibility for general education are the faculty. I would say one of the most dangerous trends in general education reform is the notion that there ought to be a separate general education faculty. That somehow, there's a gang over here, whether it's at LaGuardia or at Simple State or at Imperial University, that will be the general education faculty and there's a gang over there that's going to be the faculty for everything else. I reject this wholeheartedly because as I said at the beginning of my remarks, it's general education which explicitly expresses the values and the goals of the institution and all faculty bear responsibility for it.

I might also say, the faculty at that institution are the faculty responsible for general education. Therefore, I would even go two steps further and say that the external roles of licensing and accrediting associations of senior college faculty, should be secondary to students and faculty at the institution.

Finally, let me conclude by saying to you that general education is a topic that we can spend the next decade on, and it very much reminds me of the English critic who said "Christianity is not a bad thing, it's just never been tried." General education just has never been tried.

Thank you.

A RESPONSE TO ALISON BERNSTEIN'S KEYNOTE ADDRESS, STRIKING THE BALANCE: A FUNDER'S VIEW OF GENERAL EDUCATION

AUDREY W. HARRIGAN, LAGUARDIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE, CUNY

General Education has been defined and refined again and again, so I am sure you will permit me to define it one more time.

General Education is education that addresses the common experiences, conditions, expectations, and aspirations of men and women in general; more pointedly, General Education addresses the common competencies, assumptions, and understandings that facilitate full and equal participation in a culture.

While General Education is frequently perceived as being in opposition to specialization, it readily provides a context wherein decisions about specialization can be made and how specialization can be used most productively.

It is argued that as a result of general education one loses one's identity by being educated into the common aspects of the culture. However, evidence would suggest that in many ways general education is a reaffirmation of diversity in culture because it educates students as to the commonalities of a society and its culture and then frees them to pursue individual efforts, free of frustrations and diversions that result in being denied full participation in one's culture. Higher education should not simply be responsive to the academic domain, it must embrace both societal and individual needs and interests, enabling people to become fully functional members.

A good General Education program ought to educate students in ways that help them master certain competencies, particularly the basics—reading with understanding; writing with clarity; speaking effectively or persuasively; having proficiency with numbers. A good General Education program produces educated people who understand how they can be influenced by literature and how they can appreciate and understand music, art and dance as they relate to history and the development of various cultures. A good General Education program should enable students to function as a member of a group or a member of a particular culture. How do you know how to act in a culture unless you understand the culture in restraints? A good program should assist students to understand the notion of production and consumption and its resultant interdependence in a culture. Students should be educated about the significance of work, how work reflects values and influences the social climate. Students must have a working knowledge of financial institutions; to know less relegates them outside the mainstream of society. Students should understand not just the facts of science but also the process of science and how science relates to society. Students should understand the ideas and events that have shaped our history. They must ascertain a full understanding of where we have been and how we got to where we are, and attempt not to repeat certain mistakes. Students should learn about their shared values and beliefs in terms of the general culture, as well as various subcultures. General Education must provide insight into our behavior and how we develop our own sense of value.

The importance of organization of a general education program cannot be overlooked if we are to achieve our goals. It should be organized by content, by process, and by outcomes. And let's not forget about competencies and outcomes. The question is how do you build competencies into courses? Simply put, the outcome that you measure should be related in some way to the purpose and goals of your General Education program.

Across the nation, implementing a General Education program is characterized as being a perplexing endeavor. At the community college level one of the most pervasive problems is that of basic skills. How do you address the issue of General Education as it relates to basic skills? Can we continue to grant liberal arts credit for basic skills courses under the disguise of motivating the students or guaranteeing a financial aid package? I am not adverse to giving them credit for these purposes but not toward degree requirements. One basic skills student asked me years ago, as we

reviewed her program, "When do I catch up?" If a student can question the essence of her deficiencies, why can't we? When does she catch up? Certainly not by granting her degree credit for basic skills courses. To do so is a disservice in that the student needing the most assistance is in reality receiving the least assistance.

Have we failed? Pitcher (1970) writes "Every year, more than 380,000 students fail out of college and are looked upon with pity, suspicion and even anger. Their problems are loudly worried about, but ultimately swept under the academic carpet. No one seems to know what to do with this huge army of human beings...they are stranded in their confusion, guilt and failure...Colleges dump thousands on the failure pile annually...and the young person is often isolated on his island of rejection and left feeling there is no alternative to failure."[1] Sadly enough, institutions of higher learning take little interest or responsibility for these students.

Any General Education program must address the issues of both basic skills and dropouts. General Education will continue to be a problem if the following questions go unanswered: How do you address the issue of fragmentation of the undergraduate curriculum? How do you decide what constitutes proficiency in undergraduate studies? Just what is it an educated student needs to know? How does an institute address the diversity of the student population? One cannot assume all students will start at the same place. Where do you decide to place the emphasis—at the lowest common denominator or do you have several General Education plans? The problems of implementing a sound General Education program are many and are becoming more complexed. Therefore, it is incumbent upon institutions of higher learning to strike a balance if we are to truly succeed in preparing students for life, to function for their own good and for the good of society.

---

[1]Pitcher, R. W., and Blaushild, B. *Why College Students Fail*, New York, Funk and Wagnalls, 1970

A RESPONSE TO ALISON BERNSTEIN'S KEYNOTE ADDRESS, STRIKING THE BALANCE: A FUNDER'S VIEW OF GENERAL EDUCATION

GEORGE HIGGINBOTTOM, BROOME COMMUNITY COLLEGE, SUNY

My remarks are intended as a "friendly" review of Alison Bernstein's talk. She has presented to us a clear and cogent analysis of the various approaches to general education, and given us a fine overview of its curricular evolution. I want also to suggest that Alison's effort in sorting out these issues of general education are very much in the spirit of Gary Miller's talk last evening and President Bowen's comments this morning. They urged us all to subject general education curricula to rigorous definitional and conceptual scrutiny, and I propose to use Alison's talk to do just that.

Miller's essentially Deweyan perspective has caused him to be appropriately skeptical of prescribed learning which is not connected to the interests of learners. The most compelling argument for education is, on Miller's account, "being able to tell what one's experience is about." Making sense of one's experience, thus, ought to be the overriding aim of general education, and that is a notion which is responsive, as well, to President Bowen's insistence that general education take pluralism seriously.

Now Alison's definition of general education as "the principal vehicle through which the institution expresses what it means to be a college-educated person," is fine for openers, but is susceptible to critical interrogation. It may be, for example, that this apparently innocuous notion--"a college-educated person"--bears an elitist connotation, and disposes us to accept as fulfillment of that definition a cultural transmission model of general education. Consider instead these alternative definitions: "general education is the principal means through which the institution seeks to empower individuals," or "general education is the means through which students are helped to make sense of their experience." I would want to insist, however, that the experience referred to be vicarious as well as concrete and personal; one cannot really make much of one's experience lacking historical and cultural awareness. My own sense of general education's main purpose is even more instrumental: preparing people to be competent and effective citizens of a liberal democratic society. The precise meanings of "competent" and "effective," of course, as well as "liberal" and "democratic," will be deeply problematical.

Alison described the 1960's as an era which witnessed the abandonment of "traditional general education courses and requirements" in favor of more "relevant" offerings. Certainly that was true on many university campuses, but less so, I suspect, at community colleges. But my deeper dissent concerns the notion that there ever was a "traditional" conception of general education following the demise in the early 19th century of the classical curriculum. What came closest, I suppose, was the distribution/concentration arrangement of the curriculum that goes back to Lowell, but far from being a coherent plan for undergraduate general education, it represented a largely political accommodation of academic departments. Experiments at Columbia, Chicago, Bennington, Amherst, and Wisconsin were, it seems, interesting exceptions.

The 1970's emphases on competence and careerism, did indeed, as Alison suggests, undercut general education (especially liberal arts) courses in favor of those with more "vocational utility." The trend was toward courses and curricula which were, according to curriculum theorist Sheldon Rothblatt, "narrowly useful." The past decade has witnessed a modest revival of liberal arts courses and majors, ironically, despite the technicist and utilitarian rhetoric of business, governmental, and educational leaders.

Alison's discussion of the "three wise men--Bloom, Bennett, Hirsch--and the woman--Lynn Cheney"--is, I think right on the mark. General education does, in fact lack coherence, but the critical question is, "from whose point of view: the guardians of western culture? epistemologists? students? society?" We need to be very clear about the particular pathologies which one or another general education scheme proposes to ameliorate. General education, as Alison rightly

suggests, may be the occasion either to shore up a white, masculine, logocentric discourse of power and advantage, as some have alleged, or a means of attending to the just representation of socially marginalized women and minorities by equipping them with empowering skills and discourses. The general education prescription, in short, must be scrutinized critically for its diagnostic symptomatology.

Now in attempting to make sense of these various and confusing claims, as we must, Alison proposes an integration of the "four c's: common culture, competency, coherence, and citizenship" (she graciously added a fifth, critique). "The best education," she urged, "strikes a balance between these purposes." The failure of higher education to balance these general education goals Alison wittily captured in her four ideal type institutions--"crimson college," transfer tech," "imperial university," and "simple state college." It is indeed sobering to contemplate the range of personal, institutional, and intellectual obstacles to agreement, and we are left wondering if we have committed ourselves to a doomed project.

To the extent that the general education curriculum continues to be hostage to faculty interests and institutional power arrangements, or to narrowly utilitarian conceptions of learning, or to elitist notions of cultural coherence, we are unlikely to find adequate grounds for agreement. But if, on the other hand, we can begin to focus upon the general education learning needs of our ***students***, we might be able to make some progress. Alison's concern that students acquire "cultural and civic competence," and Gary Miller's conception of education as "being able to tell what one's experience is about," felicitously direct our inquiries toward a general education which is, as it must be, "broadly useful."

GENERAL EDUCATION AND THE TRANSFER STUDENT

MARIE JEAN LEDERMAN, BARUCH COLLEGE, CUNY

I want to make some comments based on my own experiences in this last quarter of a century at CUNY -- The City University of New York. During that time I taught or was an administrator at five community and senior colleges as well as the University's Central Office. What is also relevant were my experiences as a student in eight elementary schools in such diverse places as Mississippi, Florida, and Brooklyn; two undergraduate colleges; and two graduate schools. I am something of an expert on moving among educational institutions -- a professional outsider who learned early how to survive in disparate institutional cultures.

Alison Bernstein called general education "an important mirror of intellectual and cultural values of an institution." I would like to suggest then, that one of the important goals of a good general education is to equip students to move into and through institutions with diverse values, successfully achieving their goals within each and, perhaps, altering some of these institutions along the way.

The goal of many -- if not most -- community colleges graduates is to transfer to and graduate from a senior college. In doing so, students find themselves moving between institutions with different academic cultures. The value systems, beliefs, expectations, populations, life styles, geographical place -- sometimes even the language itself -- all vary from community to senior colleges.

In short, community college graduates who transfer will be traveling to a foreign country. What kind of travelers does the community college equip them to be?

It's obvious to state that the broader and more comprehensive students' academic knowledge, the better their skills at synthesis and analysis, the more easily they can relate new knowledge with their prior knowledge and experiences, the better they can handle the languages of mathematics, science, and written and spoken English -- the more successful their travel will be.

(In that regard, you might be interested in reading a report of a Ford Foundation project, published by the AACJC, ***Transfer: Making it Work,*** edited by Donovan, Schaier-Peleg, and Forer.

In interpreting and reacting to this report, Alison Bernstein, the project's program officer at the Ford Foundation, writes about the "emphasis on improving the academic environment of community colleges." She goes on to say that "The report insists that we ask more of students, faculty, and institutional leaders . . . . Community colleges should expect high levels of academic achievement from all their students . . . faculty should challenge better students . . . and academic standards for graduation should be clearly articulated.")

The successful traveler to a senior college needs all of this and more. That traveler needs a good ***general education*** which includes a core of disciplines such as sociology, anthropology, history, literature, psychology, political science -- disciplines whose principles and methodologies encourage the student traveler to both understand herself and to analyze, interpret, and master the institutional cultures in which she moves.

A number of today's sessions deal with the intersections of class, race, gender, and ethnicity. These are, obviously, relevant factors in understanding and navigating within cultural institutions.

The student traveler should be able, quickly, to understand the culture of the senior college in which he or she is living and the ways in which this culture differs from the community college culture left behind.

I want to note some of these differences. You must forgive me if I make generalizations to which, as always, there are exceptions.

These differences include faculty attitudes, faculty accessibility, faculty commitment to research and publication as opposed to commitment to students (resulting primarily from the senior college rewards system), faculty standards for grading, and faculty expectations of student performance, attendance, and punctuality.

Other differences include the availability and kinds of counseling and support services for students as well as the interaction -- or lack of interaction -- among faculty and counselors.

Another difference transfer students face is the difficulty of establishing and maintaining meaningful peer groups as well as dealing with the enormously diverse levels of student ability and competition within classrooms.

I would like to use two colleges I know well -- LaGuardia and Baruch College, the University's business school, as examples of two institutions far apart on most of these dimensions. And these differences are important because the majority of LaGuardia's graduates -- as well as those who transfer prior to graduation -- transfer to Baruch.

LaGuardia has the reputation -- well deserved -- of being a student-centered college. The atmosphere is uniformly warm, protective, and encouraging. It reflects the values and traditions of the college.

Baruch is a different story. I have been critical of some of the results of Baruch's value system for a very long time. But I recognize and respect its strengths. Baruch has both enormous strengths and enormous appeal to CUNY students. It is the only accredited business school within the University. It ranks 6th or 7th in the country in producing senior partners in the Big Eight Accounting firms. More immediately, Baruch's undergraduates in accountancy enter the work force with starting salaries of approximately $30,000.

The ethos at Baruch College is clear and consistent. It is to maintain academic standards and, therefore, its reputation so that its graduates can move, successfully, into the business world. And, by virtually all measures, they do. That ethos, however, also contributes to a lot of casualties. Retaining students has never been a high priority because Baruch, alone among the University's senior colleges, gets as many transfer students as entering freshmen. And it is the most popular of the University's senior colleges.

LaGuardia graduates who enter Baruch enter another country. How well are they prepared, how well are community college students generally prepared for the transition they must make? Do students who transfer understand the concept of the chilly classroom? At some senior colleges the atmosphere is positively frigid -- and not necessarily for a single group. Do students have the requisite skills to either warm the atmosphere or know how to acquire thermal underwear, lined boots and gloves, and hooded parkas to survive the frost?

Academic, cultural, and personal survival skills are all part of a good general education, for they will equip students not only to be successful in a senior college but to be successful travelers in the many institutional cultures they enter beyond the senior college.

AN ARCHAEOLOGY OF THE CANON: A LIBERAL ARTIST DIGS THE CORE

JOHN O. STEVENSON, JR., LAGUARDIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE, CUNY

Wordsworth informs us that poetry "takes its origins from emotion recollected in tranquility." About a month has passed since I delivered myself of some archaeological remarks at the conference. As I re-collect the emotional threads of that conference and weave them into my feelings upon returning from an educational mission to South Africa, my remarks have new if less than tranquil origins. While I still rely heavily on Foucault's analysis on the power of discourse and Jaynes development of the power of imaginative projection, new examples heighten the importance of those notions, so this paper is really a re-construction. At any rate quoting Wordsworth will allow Hirsch to bless me for being culturally literate.

In keynoting the conference, Gary Miller suggested that General Education should provide students with the ability to articulate the reality of their own experience. Larry Rushing responded to this in a rather deep way. Focussing on the quality of that experience instead of on the style of the articulation, Rushing asked what that would mean for a Black student who wished to convey the fact that, to paraphrase a recent National Research Council report, the social, economic, and educational gap between Blacks and whites in America will not narrow ***for the foreseeable future.*** And there the matter was joined between those who saw general education as the signature of the institutions's commitment to the preservation and communication of commonly valued knowledge and those who saw general education as implicated in a broader struggle for change and justice, who saw the institution's academic mission as having a pervasive political role.

• • • • • • • • •

A professor once walked into a large lecture hall. He was carrying a small black box. Reaching into the box he extracted a common house fly, carefully removed its legs, said in a loud voice, "Walk!", released the fly, and watched closely as the fly flew away. He repeated this process for his class twenty-four more times, each time with exactly the same results. He then addressed the class for the first and only time: "And so we may conclude that flies are deaf." This is a joke.

But it is an instructive joke in two ways. The professor's activities are a paradigmatic repetition of Descartes' scientific method. Secondly, flies are indeed deaf. Words are words and facts are facts, but it is evident that the articulated performance of the professor would carry a great deal of explanatory power for students who knew nothing of flies. Thus it is a matter of greater concern that the conclusion is true.

Michel Foucault uses the power of discourse as a basic analytic technique. Indeed the disjunctions between the discourse on a thing and the facts about the thing itself speak volumes about the nature of the society that produces the discourse. (Professor Leslie Manigat employs much the same method in analyzing the structure of Haitian political crises. For Manigat a political crisis is "a moment of nudity, propitious for applying the stethoscope to the social body".) In ***Discipline and Punish*** Foucault finds nudities in the history of the various social explanations for the activities of the criminal justice system relative to the criminal. Punishment was initially violent removal of the offender from society. Then that removal became a public spectacle for the edification of the populace. Public outcry against the lethal nature of such spectacles transformed removal into disfigurement or amputation, the criminal's continuing presence constituting a "life-long" lesson to the populace and an effective deterrent against recidivism. But if the populace could be taught, perhaps the criminal could be taught also. Thus punishment became rehabilitation rather than revenge and the locus became the prison. The prison separated the criminal from society and its architecture was ever evident to the people. Since rehabilitation needed to be seen to occur, the modality of punishment is now surveillance.

It is not without its ironies that school buildings share a great many architectural similarities with prisons (so students report) and a dominant theme of educational process is the surveillance of the student and the written and spoken manifestations of her/his mind.

Let us then look at some of the historical discourse about the Liberal Arts. As Gary Miller pointed out the Medieval University was professedly organized around the notions of authority, knowledge as a commodity, passivity, testing, and a sense of time that was linear and finite. Indeed the first "Core Curriculum" was known as the ***trivium*** (pun accidental): grammar, rhetoric and logic. This is the language of authority over and domination of persons. This was extended to include the ***quadrivium:*** arithmetic, geometry, music and astronomy. This is the language of circumscription of the physical universe, domination of the environment. And in general it was conservative in the strong sense. That is, it was intended only for those born to or chosen to dominate. It was not democratic.

To see how this undemocratic notion has profound political implications, Edward Said in ***Orientalism*** analyzes the Balfour doctrine with respect to the British occupation of Egypt and finds the twin themes of knowledge and power:

> Knowledge for Balfour means surveying a civilization from its origins to its prime to its decline - and of course it means ***being able to do that.*** ... The object of such knowledge is inherently vulnerable to scrutiny; this object is a "fact" which, if it develops, changes, or otherwise transforms itself in the way that civilizations frequently do, nevertheless is fundamentally even ontologically stable. To have such knowledge of a thing is to dominate it, to have authority over it. And authority here means for "us" to deny autonomy to "it".

For Foucault the entire intellectual program of Europe has been an attempt to represent the world to Western consciousness, "as if the world were made to be read by man." History is destroyed. It cannot be the record of the development of consciousness or the creation of new ways to reveal our identity. Our consciousness and identity are as "stable" as Egypt. Historical notions if they exist at all are "transgressive", "not the order of things, but the surface disorder of things to the degree that they are spoken."

And so when Hirsch bemoans cultural illiteracy in America, he is accusing us of a transgression from nine thousand stable, hermetic, facts. And Bloom is not really concerned that America's mind is closing. He is bedeviled by the fact that America's mind is, unaccountably, changing. America for these people is not a historical entity; it is a cultural phenomenon badly in need of preserving. The canon is the text of that cultural phenomenon and the core is the delivery system of the canon.

* * * *

I would submit that when Gary Miller speaks about general education as enabling students to articulate their experience, he is really talking about tinkering with the core, the delivery system. As a result of the "sixties" people of color and women were imported into general education. Students read Du Bois (he made Hirsch's list) and Doris Lessing (she didn't). The canon didn't change. The stew was merely colored and spiced. After a time nationalism and feminism evolved from added objects of study to methods of study in themselves. They were minority canons, if you will. Now of course the University became democratic and these minority canons found themselves competing with the majority canon for the votes of tenure, promotion, and student enrollment. The canon still didn't change. For Larry Rushing the canon, the text of the American cultural phenomenon, is emblematic of inequity. It must change. Balfour requires a response and that response must be political.

Can an academic institution engage itself in a political response? LaGuardia articulates its mission as one that seeks "to provide educational opportunities for populations that have been

denied." That sounds like a political response, but indeed it leaves the canon unchallenged. It seeks to duplicate traditional student outcomes but in a non-traditional way. Such strategies as cooperative education, collaborative learning, flexible basic skills programs based upon sophisticated diagnostic techniques, computer driven instructional and support methods and the like merely tinker with the core. These have been successful. Indeed LaGuardia is generally viewed as a "lead" community college in this respect. But the task of rendering all this politically effective is left to the individual student. S/he may have goals that range from personal liberation, to employment, to transfer, even to pleasantly passing time.

Traditional student outcomes rely upon a notion of consciousness that is table and ahistorical. And as Heidegger was fond of saying, "It is always a question of consciousness."

South Africa has no general education. Upon graduation from secondary school students plunge fully and exclusively into their major disciplines. Until quite recently South African higher education was racially segregated. Now some Black students are entering University. Their consciousness is decidedly political. A South African sociology professor I met related this story. He asked his now racially mixed class to give examples of peer pressure in their lives. White students responded with tales of dating and brand name cars. Black students related rather harrowing stories of feeling compelled to risk imprisonment. The white students were awestruck. The Black students were not amused. The political requirements of an apartheid-free South Africa cannot be met if these students do not learn to talk and work with one another. The University is the last opportunity for this learning to take place. Tinkering with the core will not do. A canon that is the text of social stability will not do.

In his ***Origins of Consciousness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind,*** Julian Jaynes attempts a definition of consciousness that will help these students. Initially he is not so much interested in the "what-ness" of consciousness as he is in its origin, not its content but the process of its evolution, not its stability but its historicity. He concludes that consciousness does not originate in matter, nor as a fundamental property of life. It is not coextensive with associative memory or conditioned responses. Neither can it be seen as a category of Being that is imposed from outside. Some have proposed that it really is nothing at all or merely an accident of evolution, or perhaps just behaviorism in disguise. While these hard-minded notions are attractive, they do not coincide with our own experience of consciousness as a crucial kind of interiority and introspection. Moreover Jaynes argues that "consciousness is a much smaller part of our mental life than we are conscious of." It is not in use when we play the piano, walk, dance, speak or write, remember, learn, form concepts, judge, reason, or even think.

Take this simple test. What is the next symbol in the following series:

* / * / * ?

If you try to be conscious of what you did to determine "/", you will not retrieve the process. You will IMAGINE what you think the process must have been.

Lastly, if you ask a person where in the body consciousness is, the response is invariably "in my head" or more particularly, "behind my eyes". How silly! There isn't any room.

Jaynes rejects any notions of memory being implicated in consciousness. Thus consciousness cannot be stable. And the Western intellectual program of representing the world to consciousness, to make it "readable" for all men, is doomed. For Jaynes consciousness is dialogic or analogic imagination. It allows us to carry on enormous "as if" calculations in our minds and then see if the results are applicable in the real world. What is crucial to consciousness is that we ourselves are components of the calculations. Thus our white South African students can do more than merely imagine being imprisoned; they can imagine themselves being imprisoned because they are Black.

We have come some distance from Gary Miller and Larry Rushing. But perhaps now Gary can imagine why Larry wants to change the cannon; and perhaps Larry can imagine why Gary only wants to tinker with core.

CRITERIA FOR A CANON OF LEARNING

JAMES P. YESS, DEAN OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, MASSASOIT COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND VISITING FELLOW, NEW ENGLAND RESOURCE CENTER FOR HIGHER EDUCATION, JOHN W. MCCORMACK INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS, UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS - BOSTON

Academic debate in higher education during the 1980's has returned to a question every society manages to answer in one form or another - "What ought we teach the next generation?" This question does not necessarily appear with each new generation. When it does arise, however, it is usually the result of some internal or external stress. Today, the question is being repeatedly and forcefully asked because American leaders see the United States losing economic power in the world. They believe it is due to a weakening of our ability to compete in the international marketplace. The fear of serious economic vulnerability has fueled the ongoing internal debate about the loss of moral and educational standards. Recent calls for curriculum reform in higher education spring primarily from the psychological impact of the external economic threat. Riding the wave of self-doubt and loss of confidence are those who call for a return to the days when there were standards in the conduct of one's life and in what college students were expected to learn. Often when a society believes it is losing prestige, it adopts methods responsible for its previous ascendency. The question "What ought we teach the next generation?", at a time of external economic threat and the concomitant reaction to the indifference of post-modernism illicits memories of past dominance. With these memories comes the attribution of our past economic successes to technological innovation and the supply of a well educated workforce.

By unleashing our superior innovative capacity on the international economic battlefield, we believe our technology will assure us, as it has in the past, of recapturing lost markets and regaining stature as the world's leading economic power. The history of educational reform in the United States also reveals an underlying pattern. There is a direct sequence of reforming impetus proceeding from the type of external threat, to the chosen method of survival, to the question "What ought we to teach the next generation?". The answers to the question are framed by the solution to the external threat. If the external peril were military or environmental the proposed solutions would engender a different tonal quality in response to the educational question. Consequently, they would attract appropriate curricular remedies. Similarly, if the threat were internal such as massive civil unrest, or rampant juvenile delinquency, the anguished question "What ought we to teach the next generation?" would find an emphasis in the context of social reform. The solutions thrust upon schools would be akin to those we experienced during the 60's and early 70's. In this scenario, the imperatives of technology would take a subordinate position to the issues of redistribution of wealth and social justice.

Gary Quehl, President of the Council for Advancement and Support of Education, supports the view that higher education is usually in a reactive mode when it comes to public purpose. He says in a recent article (1988):

> the purposes of American higher education have always been shaped by the needs and circumstances of the times and the availability of human and financial resources. Typically, as historian Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., has observed, a national need of great magnitude arises from the common culture to galvanize public policy and social action. The founding of land-grant colleges and universities in the 1860's comes to mind, as do the unprecedented G.I. Bill after World War II, or enormous scientific response to the Soviet launch of Sputnik in 1958, and the unparalleled expansion of educational and economic opportunity during the 1960's that arose from great social legislation enacted by the United States Congress. (p. 7)

Today, the question "What ought we to teach the next generation?" is asked in a reactionary atmosphere hostile to post-modern relativism. The external economic threat and the erosion of cultural norms have encouraged the pronouncements of those who are philosophically

perennialists and essentialists. Witness the national report "To Reclaim a Legacy" (1984) written by William Bennett, then Director of the National Endowment for the Humanities. Bennett bids us to return college students to the great books of philosophy and classical literature. A second report, written by a committee sponsored by the Association of American Colleges in 1985 called "Integrity in the College Curriculum," attacks the mind-narrowing vocationlism encouraged by a freewheeling elective system. It recommends a core curriculum that would emphasize inquiry, literacy, numeracy, history, science, values, art, international and multicultural experiences, and a study in depth of one discipline. Even the report by the National Institute of Education, "Involvement in Learning" (1984), while using the language of progressivism, makes its case for a return to the central role of liberal arts and urges educators to unify the curriculum through "the shared values and knowledge that bind us together as a society." In the main, these reports and the many others that followed them prescribe more requirements and less choice for students, more centering of the curriculum in the traditional liberal arts disciplines, and more study of classical works in literature and philosophy. Echoing these themes are the enormously popular and widely quoted ***The Closing of the American Mind*** (1987) by Allan Bloom and ***Cultural Literacy*** (1987) by E.D. Hirsch. The most recent report "Humanities in American" (1988) issued by Lynne V. Cheney of the National Endowment for the Humanities clearly upholds perennialism in the face of the poststructuralism offered at places such as Carnegie Mellon University. Gary Waller, head of the English department at C.M.U., rejects perennialism and in its place advances an undergraduate curriculum in literature that employs the analytic methods of deconstructionism, feminism, Marxism, and psychoanalysis. Cheney's report counters with, "The humanities are about more than politics, about more than social power. What gives them their abiding worth are truths that pass beyond time and circumstance - truths that, transcending accidents of class, race, and gender, speak to us all." Ridiculing this sentiment, Stanley Fish, Chairman of Duke University's English Department asked recently "Once you have subtracted from the accidents of class, race, gender, and political circumstance, what is it that you have left?" (Chronicle of Higher Education 9/28/88)

Perennialist and essentialist reformers have the public's ear today because public attitudes have been predisposed to them. Public conversation about higher education is attracted to issues such as falling SAT scores, core curriculum, general education, cultural literacy, teacher education, assessment, and educational outcomes. Embedded within each of these issues is the call for greater competence in language, mathematics, science, and reasoning ability. The pressures of the external economic threat have inevitably led to less choice, fewer electives, more prescriptions and more course requirements.

The picture I have drawn thus far suggests that political forces play a major role in determining canonical priorities. In one decade, educators are asked to emphasize business, engineering, mathematics, and science. In another epoch, the cycle shifts and we find ourselves trying to satisfy the demand, stirred by social activism, for more public servants and health care workers. In the midst of these apparently periodic tidal forces can we not find some canonological bedrock that withstands the ebb and flow of political necessity? Do we need some rational way of determining what is best to know as human beings? In other words, can we bracket ourselves in Husserlian fashion from the background of our present lives and allow ourselves to freely derive a canon of learning? Given a similar problem in epistemology, Descartes devised his methodological reduction to free himself from the possibility of deception. Through this method he concluded that certainty was attainable. Is there a similar rational method that would allow us to coax from our minds an unassailable canon? Having arrived at the canon, we could save beleaguered educators the cyclical trauma of curriculum reform. Surely, it would be a practical necessity to adjust the curriculum for the economic and political realities of our society but at least the core would abide amidst the flux. For any age, and for any person in college, can we find a method that helps us produce a stable canon of learning?

The method used by John Rawls to arrive at a theory of justice might very well provide the necessary conceptual apparatus for the task. Rawls in his 1971 landmark work, ***A Theory of Justice,*** does for social philosophy what Descartes did for epistemology and Husserl did for phenomenology. Rawls provides a way of establishing principles of justice in a rational

environment free from contamination by self-interest. It may be that this method can be transferred from social theory to educational theory for the purpose of arriving at a canon.

Rawls proposes a society in which its members devise a social contract, setting forth basic principles of justice. Rawls asks us to formulate social principles that will regulate how institutions will distribute rights, duties, and opportunity. Hence, Rawls's focus is on justice as fairness. Those who take the role of formulating the principles of justice as fairness are said to be in "the original position." We imagine people, in the initial phase of developing rules of cooperation, will be setting the terms of their social contract through rational deliberation. The purity of this rational deliberation on the principles of justice is assured through a device Rawls calls "the veil of ignorance." It is through this technique that Rawls is able to neutralize the damaging effects of self-interest on the process of rational deliberation and arriving at a justification for a set of fair governing principles. The veil keeps those in the original position from knowing their own particular circumstances or future condition in the new community. Rawls (1971) describes just how opaque the veil must be:

> It is assumed, then, that the parties do not know certain kinds of particular facts. First of all, no one knows his place in society, his class position or social stature; nor does he know his fortune in the distribution of natural assets and abilities, his intelligence and strength and the like. Nor, again, does anyone know his conception of the good, the particulars of his rational plan of life, or even the special features of his psychology such as his aversion to risk or liability to optimism or pessimism. More than this, I assume that the parties do not know the particular circumstances of their own society. That is, they do not know its economic or political situation, or the level of civilization and culture it has been able to achieve. The persons in the original position have no information as to which generation they belong....
>
> As far as possible, then, the only particular facts which the parties know is that their society is subject to the circumstances of justice and whatever this implies. It is taken for granted, however, that they know the general facts about human society. They understand political affairs and the principles of economic theory; they know the basis of social organization and the laws of human psychology. Indeed, the parties are presumed to know whatever general facts affect the choice of the principles of justice. (p. 137.)

From the objectivity afforded by the veil of ignorance, Rawls contends that rational people in the original position will choose two principles of justice upon which to structure society: (1) the principle of equal liberty and (2) the difference principle. The principle of equal liberty ensures that each person in the society has maximum freedom and equal rights with respect to speech; assembly; thought; vote; the holding of public office; religion; holding property; and freedom from arbitrary government action. These rights are protected unless their exercise diminishes the equal rights of others. The difference principle allows inequalities to be arranged if they can be shown to benefit the least advantaged. In other words, according to the difference principle, physicians can receive more status and wealth in the community if this inequality can be shown to draw more people into a profession that will care for those least advantaged by nature.

Rawls's theory is intricate and argued at length in his book. His work goes far beyond this cursory explanation, but I have provided enough of it to be able now to transfer the methodology to the problem of developing a canon of learning in higher education. We turn to the question, "What ought we to teach the next generation?" only this time it is examined under the veil of ignorance.

Imagine being in the original position. We do not know our occupation or social status. We are blind to our own natural talents, intelligence, interests, personality and plan of life. We don't even know into what society we are born. We know nothing about its economic or political structure; its history; folklore; or traditions. The only prior information we have is that the particular society into which we are to be placed wants to educate its citizenry. Furthermore, we

will assume that Rawls's equal liberty and difference principles of justice are operative. Essentially, this means that whatever we judge as worthy of learning, all citizens will have an equal opportunity to learn it. If some excel in given fields of study, they will be given greater opportunities for advancement, only insofar as it will benefit the least fortunate.

It seems to me that if I am ignorant of my individual circumstances, I would want an education that would satisfy the goal of fostering the success of two entities: the group (society) and the individual (me). Even if the group were reduced to a nomadic tribe, I would still want to learn the ways of the tribe and pass techniques of survival on to my children. I need to learn how to survive as an individual and how to perpetuate the good and successful tribe. The family, tribe or community is as much a source of my survival and happiness as my own particular powers. The issue is, therefore, reduced to the question: "What would I want to learn that would help me survive in the world?" The underlying philosophy would be one of ***utility***. Remember, I have no idea of my status, talents or the type of social group in which I am a member. All I know is that whatever there is to learn will be available to all and more will be available in some cases if it helps the less fortunate; which might be me.

In this artificial and culture-free social environment for which I set forth the structure of education, it is apparent that only the most general prescription will accommodate the overarching principle of survival utility. In this context, therefore, I list the basic objectives to which, I am sure, others could be added. This is not a startlingly new list and is taken from the vantage of someone who must formulate a body of knowledge and skills worth learning as a human being. At the cost of being presumptuous, but under the handicap of the veil of ignorance, all human beings should minimally learn, to the extent of their capacities, the following:

-How to maintain and strengthen health;
-How the world of physical objects works;
-How societies achieve their goals;
-How to invent/create;
-How to understand the way people behave individually and in groups;
-How to communicate and persuade;
-How to love;
-How to acquire stories of communal events that undergird the social system;
-How to achieve moral behavior;
-How to advance knowledge of all the above.

The presumption, as in Rawls's exposition on justice, is that these general notions about what an absolute, culture-free curriculum should contain is the result of rational deliberation. This, then, is my canon of education in the original position. The set of objectives can be customized in the particular case; for instance, if I lived in an agrarian society, the primary areas of knowledge I would like to learn under the general rubric of "knowledge of the physical world" is how can I make plants and animals grow. For the hunting culture, I would need to learn the habits of animals in the wild and how I can effectively kill game. For the child in a poor urban area an understanding of street culture would have survival benefits.

Each of the elements of the culture-free canon initiated in the original position can find specific application in any given cultural frame of reference. But it is precisely at the moment we are compelled to raise the veil of ignorance in order to apply the canon to a particular instance that our canon fractures. Notice that the directive of learning moral behavior will eventually lead in its application to a relativist position. In one place and time it may be considered desirable to have as many offspring as possible because of some natural catastrophe which destroyed a large portion of the population. Under these circumstances, social institutions might encourage those of childbearing age to increase their sexual encounters by casting the activity in the light of moral obligation. In another place at the same time, a population explosion might require social institutions to discourage a high frequency of sexual activity by calling it immoral. The point is that once contradictory statements can be derived from the canon, the canon becomes less elegant

and, in the case of learning about correct moral behavior; vacant. Except for perhaps a very small number of universal moral principles, morality is yoked to the back of the culture that pulls it.

The issue might be raised that I chose the most problematic objective, that of moral behavior, and that if it were eliminated from the canon the remaining objectives for education might survive. Unfortunately, it is likely that all the others would similarly fail. Take, for example, the desideratum of knowing how to maintain and strengthen health. Medicine is thought to be a purely objective application of scientific experimentation. Curing the patient in Western Culture is an exercise in applied science, where observation and induction play the major roles. Medical facts apparently rise above the din of culture, or do they?

Lynn Payer's ***Medicine and Culture*** (1988) assaults the facticity of medicine. To her, cure is married to culture. Payer contends that if medicine were only a matter of applied science, and if two different societies had the same technical knowledge, then patients suffering from the same disease would receive the same treatment. Under these conditions, however, Payer finds more dissimilarities than similarities among treatments in France, England, West Germany and the United States. She records wide variation in the treatment of the same disease. The amount of the drug of choice and the length of time prescribed to take it vary widely from one country to another. Surgery is twice as frequent in the United States as in England. Mastectomy rates are three times greater. Blood pressure levels treated in the United States are thought normal in Great Britain. Payer maintains that the low birth rate in France influences surgeons to conservatively treat disease of the reproductive organs. Hence, 2.4 percent of ***all*** French women have hysterectomies whereas 2 percent of American women ***between*** 35 and 44 endure the operation. According to the author, there is an enormous difference in how Europeans think about disease. They believe that ill health signals a weakness in the body's defenses. Americans, on the other hand, look for harmful invasive agents to eradicate. This aggressive American posture, according to Payer, is a product of our conquering frontier mentality, litigiousness, and the analogy holding sway in our culture which compares the body to a machine. When the body malfunctions, the operative dictum in our culture is - fix it.

Diana Dutton in her book, ***Worse Than The Disease*** (1988), mentions some of the pitfalls of rushing to fix it. The treatment used in the 1940's to prevent miscarriages, diethylstibestrol (DES), led to carcinoma of the vagina in daughters of women who took DES. The crash program begun in 1965 to develop an artificial heart resulted seventeen years later (1982) in the first insertion of an artificial heart in Barney Clark's chest at the University of Utah. After several months of watching Clark's health slip on the evening T.V. news, he died of several strokes caused by the pump. The Ford administration in 1976 decided to conduct a mass vaccination campaign against a predicted pandemic of swine flu which never materialized. More serious illness and deaths resulted from the vaccination than from the swine flu. The imperative to subdue nature fueled by nationalistic zeal and historical achievements directs thinking along tracks previously laid by the prevailing culture.

Similarly, Arthur Kleinman in his ***Rethinking Psychiatry*** (1988) launches an attack on psychiatry because it defines mental illness in the restricted vision of Western European and American psychiatry. The treatment of the mentally ill, says Kleinman, is culture-bound. He contends that a diagnosis in psychiatry is an attempt to fit the reported problems of the patient into the structure the profession has established for mental diseases. These structures and the mediating interpretations made between illness and disease by the physician are, for Kleinman, products of the culture. He gives as an example the patient who complains about depression because her mother-in-law has come to live with her family. The competent therapist in China might advise the patient of her responsibility to take care of her old and failing mother-in-law. It is unlikely that the patient would receive the same advice from an American psychiatrist. She may not receive any advice at all.

Facts are not merely facts. History, time and value coauthor facts and what we need from them is a continuous story about truth. Metaphysics recapitulates epistemology and axiology.

What we see under the veil of ignorance is a world liberated from particulars; aglow in the warm light of abstraction. To merely say, however, that our lives cannot be lived in the abstract is insufficient. To simply submit that for educational purposes the technique of using a veil of ignorance in the original position becomes vacuous for a particular society, is also insufficient. This method of rational reduction has, after all, given us a set of reasonable principles that might serve as a foundation for a canon, howsoever removed they are from practical existence and the possibility of logically consistent application.

The problem with using Rawls's method for a canon of education is not so much what the method produces in the end but what assumption was made in the beginning. The erroneous assumption being that in the structure of society, justice and education are both foundational. The question, "How ought we to regard one another in a social contract?" is of a different order than "What ought we to teach the next generation?" The terms of the social contract require the question of justice to be treated, while the subject of education need not be considered at all during the initial constitutional convention. Until the ground rules are ratified, issues such as education, health care, and social services wait in the background until given a structural vehicle through which they can be defined and expressed. Thus, our own constitution does not specifically mention education, but it does formulate the doctrines of freedom of speech (First Amendment) and states rights (Tenth Amendment). It is in this conceptual environment that a theory of education is constructed.

History is replete with examples of governments using education to promote political ends. At times, leaders concerned with social control block embarrassing truth. Breaking down this social barrier to truth may take centuries as it did in the case of heliocentrism. In 200 BC Aristarchus of Samos advanced the notion that the sun was the center of the universe. Few of consequence listened even when it was repeated by Copernicus in the 16th century and Galileo in the 17th century. Ecclesiastical authorities feared that if heliocentrism caught on their political influence, based on the doctrine of geocentrism and supported by divine scripture, would be undermined. Thus, education can be guided by a culture's collective consciousness or held fast by political suppression depending on the tenor of the times.

In the face of these forces and in light of the fact that educational goals follow the dictates of fundamental social principles such as a particular formulation of justice, it does not make any sense to set a canon of education outside the political and social framework. Education is the servant not the master of politics and social life. Hence, any educational standard reflects the perspective of the social group at a particular time. It is the contemporary representation of mediated truth. Reform in education is driven by social and political reform.

The method, therefore, of devising a canon can start with the generalities produced by Rawls's method of the veil of ignorance but must then be distilled into a set of culturally derived particulars. This means asking the question, "What ought we to teach the next generation?" in the context of shared values. Instead of answering the question as if one were immobilized in the original position, we should look at the true nature of education as both a support for the legends, values, and civic personality and as a pragmatic tool of survival for contemporary society.

CONCLUSION

Recent concerns expressed about a canon of learning higher education come amidst two messages: (1) that college students are ignorant of their cultural heritage and values and (2) that they are ill prepared to reverse this country's apparent slide in economic competitiveness. Specifically, the debate about what body of works every student should know or even if there should be a list of such works, is set on the stage of post-modernism and its erosion of authority. The American culture has become according to its critics, a mere federation of tastes. With this definition of the problem we find ourselves on a familiar battleground in education. It is the conceptual stage of an apparent dualism where two rival ideas struggle for dominance. John Dewey cautioned that these dualisms or ideas in opposition are usually the result of a faulty construction of the problem.

At the heart of our present discussion about a canon of learning is lodged seeming dichotomies between stability and adaptation, absolute standards and relativistic guidelines. It is possible, however, that the juxtaposition of these concepts represent false oppositions or dualisms. Often, the construction of a dualism clouds complexity but offers psychological succor to our instinct for separating the world into two's: true and false; us and them. The assumption that a canon in higher education must either represent abiding cultural values through eternally revered authors or open learning with no values at all is counterproductive.

The attempt in this paper has been to indicate a way around the roadblock of this false dichotomy. The suggestion is that general, abiding principles of a canon can be obtained through a method such as the "veil of ignorance" used b John Rawls in his search for principles of justice. But, additionally, that a specific set of prescriptions for learning which are relative to the demands of a particular society at a particular time, derived from the general principles, can legitimately direct what students ought to know.

REFERENCES

Bennett, William. *To Reclaim a Legacy*. National Endowment forthe Humanities, 1984.

Bloom, Allan. *The Closing of the American Mind*. New York: Simonand Schuster, 1987.

Cheney, Lynne V. *Humanities in America*. National Endowment forthe Humanities, 1988.

Dutton, Diana with Preston, Thomas A. and Pfund, Nancy E. *Worse Than the Disease*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Hirsch, E. D., Jr. *Cultural Literacy*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1987.

Integrity in the College Curriculum. Association of American Colleges, 1985.

Involvement in learning. National Institute of Education, 1984.

Kleinman, Arthur. *Rethinking Psychiatry*. New York: The Free Press, 1988.

Payer, Lynn. *Medicine and Culture*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1988.

Quehl, Gary H. "Higher Education and the Public Interest"*Academe*. Vol. 74, No. 5 (September-October, 1988), 7-11.

Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971.

EVELYN EDSON

This past summer a group of 18 community college faculty met in the middle of our road of life to study the works of Dante Alighieri. We began in a dark and savage wood, but were gradually led toward the light by our teacher, but also by our own efforts. Thus, like Dante, we began being led by Vergil, but at last, leaving our noble guide, mounted to Paradise on our own.

This poetic introduction is completely appropriate for our experience in this summer's NEH seminar. For those of us who took part in it, it was a wonderful experience. We were a group that included faculty of all divisions--from respiratory therapy to data processing to Spanish and psychology--who were brought together in the type of general education experience that we are forever prescribing for our students. As our students usually find, it was enriching and enlightening for us all.

We began with the poems of ***Vita Nuova,*** but quickly went on to study the ***Inferno*** in some detail, followed by more cursory examinations of ***Purgatorio*** and ***Paradiso.*** Everybody participated on their own level, contributing from the knowledge of their own discipline. Our three representatives of the health technologies, for example, were particularly helpful in elucidting medical matters, while our geologist held us spellbound with a slide show of caving expeditions which had uncanny reference to underground scenes in the ***Inferno.***

While this faculty seminar did not have a direct relevance to curriculum for most of us, the effect was profound. A science teacher reported that, as a scientist in a humanities course, he was helped to understand how a humanities type feels in a science course. Others were impressed by our teacher's style in leading discussion and vowed to try to improve their own. We gained a new respect for our colleagues, and found it more than refreshing to be sitting in a group of faculty discussing something more cosmic than the drop/add form.

In terms of the overall culture of the college, we have now co-sponsored two Dante lectures with the University of Virginia, but more significant has been the re-energizing of middle-aged faculty and the bringing together of a group which previously had not had much in common.

We plan two other seminars, one on Plato's Republic and an interdisciplinary one on the baroque, to be held in the two coming summers. We also held a writing workshop/retreat for faculty, based on Thoreau's Walden. We see these experiences as a significant contribution to the cultural vitality of our college.

TERESA COOK

In April 1989, coinciding with the "William Wordsworth and the Age of English Romanticism" exhibit, we held a romantic poetry reading, with the idea that a project like this would open windows to the outside world in space and time. English, French, German and Spanish students participated in the project, which was very well attended by the general student population.

The instructors met and decided to select themes that were common to the general romantic movement, such as love and death, but each language reflected the uniqueness of the movement in each culture. The students were able to see how writers from different countries and epochs felt about universal, human themes familiar to them.

Many of the English poems dealt with nature and intimacy. In the case of France, the rebellion against the traditional political and literary constraints was discussed along with the poems. Spain produced, in addition, poems full of patriotic and religious feelings.

Although only second-year foreign language and English students participated directly in the reading, students from different levels and backgrounds were present, and many expressed the desire to learn a foreign language in order to be able to read and understand literature in its original language version. Suddenly, a foreign language opened new possibilities to them. Now it's more than a vehicle to communicate with people from other countries.

Each instructor gave a brief, general view of the romantic background, including pertinent biographical facts about the poets presented. Then the students explained in English the content of the poems and their personal interpretation, so that the audience could better understand and appreciate the second part of the reading, which was in the original language. The students discussed how familiar and common human feelings were expressed in a poetic way in different languages and cultures. And, because we are a community college with a wide variety in our student population, the readers represented a wide range of age and background.

BARBARA MACCALLUM

The fine arts program at Piedmont Virginia Community College offers a two-year associate degree in fine arts and a one-year certificate in crafts production. Although many of our students transfer to four-year institutions, the majority of our students are successful, mid-career members of the community who are taking studio or art history classes for enrichment.

Until two years ago, the art department operated out of a basement area that doubled as storage for Buildings and Grounds. With the addition of a new science and technology wing, vacated areas were renovated and we now have a large art studio space with two skylights, three windows and ample storage space. We also have a room with a large screen and pin board walls for art history lectures. However, probably the most valued space we acquired was a small art gallery that has show spaces on its exterior walls as well as being fully equipped inside with specially designed walls and movable track lighting. Adjacent to the gallery, in the student lounge area, we have a built-in glass display area for showing pottery and jewelry; there are also two walls of display boards in the student lounge and a hallway of display boards by the art area for showing 2D work.

Each year I organize six shows for the art gallery. These shows display the work of community artists who submit slides for selection. In addition, there is an art faculty show and a college-wide open show every other year. Each year we also have a traveling museum show which integrates the arts and the humanities and is used by humanities instructors as a teaching tool. This year, for example, we are showing Warrington Colescott's prints for Death In Venice, a book being read by the humanities classes.

The central location of the art gallery and the visibility of student art around the college has increased an awareness of art in the community. The shows are reviewed in our local newspaper along with photographs of the work, and the attendance for each show has been excellent.

Each year I visit the area high schools and put up a display of PVCC students' work. I give a talk on our program to juniors and seniors, making them aware of the size and variety of our art offerings.

We have started a visiting artist program. Last year a nationally known sculptor gave a public lecture on his work. This year an artist will spend four days on campus giving slide lectures to students who are not normally exposed to art. Instructors in science, nursing and business have agreed to give 40 minutes of their class time to enable their students to listen to the visiting artist explain in simple terms how and why an artist makes art.

In all of these ways, art has become accessible to everyone in the community and through exposure we hope to make art a part of everyone's daily life.

JAMES R. PERKINS

I am president of Blue Ridge Community College in Weyers Cave, Virginia. However, until July 1 of this year I was dean of instruction at Piedmont Virginia Community College in Charlottesville, Virginia. It is the experience of Piedmont Virginia Community College and its efforts to strengthen its cultural environment that we are here to describe.

It is my role to provide the background and the introduction. Dr. Evelyn Edson, professor of history; Dr. Kay Bethea, professor of music and theatre; Dr. Teresa Cook, professor of spanish; and Ms. Barbara MacCallum, professor of art, will describe their experiences in integrating the humanities into all aspects of the college.

In 1982 the president of the college appointed an ad hoc committee of faculty and staff to consider the role of general education at the college and to recommend principles of general education which could guide the college. After nearly one year, the committee produced a document entitled "Position Paper Number One: General Education at Piedmont Virginia Community College." This document was widely discussed, modified, and finally approved by all elements of the college, including the board.

Following acceptance of this position paper, a second ad hoc committee was formed to examine the college and to recommend means for implementing the stated goals of general education in all aspects of the college. The position paper and the resulting ad hoc committee have helped guide the college in ways many never thought were possible.

Although the effects were many, I will discuss two effects which I consider most important. First, the ad hoc committee quickly realized that if the college was going to affect the general education of its students, it could not rely solely on the classroom or the curricula. The activities of the college that occur outside the classroom could provide an outstanding avenue for helping students develop aspects of general education as outlined in the position paper. Second, the committee concluded that if we were to make progress in achieving our general education goals we would need to provide a greater role for the humanities in the education of our students.

In order to incorporate principles of general education in activities outside the classroom, the college organized several programs. One program in particular, the college "Window Series," brought speakers and performers to the college to address particular areas of general education. Examples include a talk on what a mathematician really does, a performance by a string quartet, a discussion of the effect of the mind on athletic performance, a discussion by a film maker on how a short story was made into a film, and a talk on how the universe began. All events were coordinated with class activities which helped students prepare for the presentations.

The ad hoc committee on general education also influenced the construction or renovation of several college facilities to help bring the principles of general education to out of class activities. Examples include, the construction of a college art gallery, the creation of a display space for student art and other projects throughout the campus, the construction of theatre space and space to teach music, and the construction of a fitness center for students and faculty.

As a result of our focus on the humanities, the college now requires at least one humanities course in each curriculum. A National Endowment for the Humanities grant was developed and funded to help incorporate the humanities in all aspects of the college. Our grant has helped us to develop and teach an interdisciplinary course in the humanities, to hire a philosophy teacher, to sponsor several faculty seminars and workshops, and to improve our library holdings in the humanities.

KAY BETHEA

This is the third year of the interdisciplinary humanities course, Survey of Western Culture, which is team-taught by four instructors. The first year, we offered two sections; the second year, three sections; and this year, four sections. Each of us now "anchors" a section and participates in the other three according to our areas of specialization: literature, art history, theatre, music, and philosophy.

As part of the course and the overall program in the humanities, we schedule various related cultural events. We have scheduled field trips to the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts in Richmond to see Greek vases, to the Washington National Cathedral to learn about Gothic architecture, and to plays and concerts in Charlottesville. We also brought, with the help of our college foundation, the National Shakespeare Company to town to perform ***As You Like It*** last year. This January they are returning with a production of ***Hamlet***. We adapt our reading list each year to take advantage of such productions.

We have our own program of two major theatre productions each year at PVCC and try to choose one that will fit into the western culture course, as well as other humanities courses. For example, in Fall 1987 we produced Sophocles' ***Antigone*** and read the play in our class. Our "captive audience" resulted in sell-out crowds! In the Fall of 1988 the University of Virginia put on Euripides' ***Trojan Women***. We included the play in our syllabus and had all of our students attend. Then, in the spring we studied modern realism and put on a production of Ibsen's ***Hedda Gabler.***

This fall we are producing ***A Night of French Comedy,*** including Ionesco, Feydeau, and two French Canadian short plays translated by our French teacher. This production is designed to relate to the French classes and the bicentennial of the French Revolution.

One of our biggest problems with on-campus cultural events in the past had been attendance. By thoughtfully coordinating these events with our classes, we not only assure good (and well-informed) audiences, but we greatly enrich the classroom experience.

A "METHOD CORE" CURRICULUM

NORAH C. CHASE, KINGSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE

I have an idea which combines developing a core curriculum and improving our teaching methods (by making them more appropriate for CUNY's very diverse student body).

I envision a core curriculum based on teaching method (pedagogy) rather than solely on content. Instead of specifying a few courses to be call "core" (and trying to figure out and include "the most important facts and concepts" in a few required core courses simultaneously losing the variety of our current course offerings), a method core would be based on key questions in each discipline.

In a method core, each discipline would decide which were the key questions, the most important methods, and basic ideas of that discipline which really should be discussed in every basic course in that discipline. I am referring to basic concepts and questions in each field. I can not presume to say what these fundamental questions and methods are in disciplines other than my own and even in my own field this would need intensive discussion among the English faculty, but I will give some examples of what I mean.

Every English Department course should discuss the nature of language. Every literature courses should cover how language is used, the difference between poetic and scientific language and the continuum between those two as well as the metaphorical use of language, its purposes and limitations. Every literature course should consider the concept of "genre" and the structure of literary forms--how do structure and content relate? These are just comments to begin a discussion of what could be the common denominators in every literature course (or at least every "basic" literature course) given in the college, be it in the English Department or the Foreign Language Department or elsewhere.

Every history course, it seems to me, should raise questions about what is the nature of historical evidence, how does a historian determine what really happened, how does s/he weigh a piece of evidence or make a judgment. How are generalizations and period names arrived at? How valid are they? I apologize in advance for trying to work this out for another discipline; I use this merely as an example of the kind of thing I mean.

In science, surely every science course should discuss what the scientific method is, its origin, its advantages and its limitations. But perhaps I am wrong; perhaps there are far more important and fundamental questions in science. A discussion of this question, would be fascinating. Would our science department want to include an ethics question as basic to the study of science?

An advantage of the method core is that we would create consensus within our own community and a model that could be adapted for other communities which would certainly have somewhat different situations and needs. The key questions would vary to some extent from college to college and would certainly need to be changed over time as concerns within the discipline itself change. This method works well with interdisciplinary courses as well.

This idea is very exciting and innovative. It comes out of my work with several groups: with an independent pedagogy group which included faculty from public and private institutions and various disciplines, with a seminar in the new social history given by the late Distinguished Professor Herbert Gutman, CUNY Graduate Center, and the Ford Foundation Project on Community College Core Curriculum which I co-directed and which created both content and pedagogy faculty development seminars. This project involved faculty from four CUNY community colleges, two CUNY senior colleges, Peter Elbow's work and students at Stony Brook University, six community colleges across the country, and Zelda Gamson and Roberta Matthews as evaluators.

I think this idea fits in with what I heard in all those situations although no one has tried anything quite like a method core. In terms of both core and teaching methods there appears to be enormous room for disagreement and discovery. In our research we found that there is no one answer and no one expert on how to teach the diverse population we have in CUNY. There is some good information on the cultures of our students and their learning styles. There is some information and some interesting studies on various experiments with classroom structure. But no one has put it together to create "the best teaching method" for the community college or college level. There are a lot of good ideas out there about teaching methods, but most of the work still remains to be done. Obviously, there is enormous controversy over the concept of core curriculum and the concept of a set cannon or a revised cannon.

A method core has several important advantages:

1. The entire faculty and administration would be involved in a discussion regarding the basic questions and concepts of each discipline.

2. This discussion could go on at the departmental level so that discussion would be faculty-based and would happen among small groups. The sense of discipline and expertise would be preserved in these groups. We would work on teaching methods and core simultaneously.

3. The faculty would be directly involved in the process which would be good for faculty morale; the process itself would be intellectually challenging and stimulating. (Furthermore, we will avoid the exhausting and divisive turf wars which so often become the real politics of core.)

4. The list of key questions and concepts for each discipline could be easily printed and shared with students and the whole college. Faculty in each department would have shared objectives and the departments would know each other's goals.

5. A concomitant part of discussing the key questions and concepts would be to discuss the way to raise such questions effectively. Actual teaching methods that would be and are effective in multi-ethnic, multi-racial and multi-age range classrooms would need to be considered. The results of the discussion of teaching methods could be printed with the list of basic questions and concepts and disseminated throughout each college and shared with other colleges.

6. A publication for additional dissemination is a natural outcome of this effort.

7. This approach to core will appeal to granting agencies because:

   a. it is highly innovative;

   b. it involves the faculty in an important and renewing way;

   c. it considers ethnicity, race, sex, age, etc;

   d. a concrete product will result--a publication listing key questions and concepts and teaching techniques for each discipline and for interdisciplinary studies if applicable. This would also probably include a study or studies of the study body at particular colleges, the changing student population at CUNY and/or nationwide;

   e. if a methodological core were created, it would be necessary to conduct a major and sophisticated study of its effectiveness. If the initial idea appeals to grant agencies, then the evaluation might also be funded.

The appeal of this approach to granting agencies is important because faculty would need some release time to read new material, to think and to discuss such important issues. In this time of one budget crisis after another, it seems impossible to think about release time without thinking of some kind of outside grant.

It may be encouraging to recall that Manhattan Community College received an NEH grant to develop a core (for which the paired courses developed under Ford Foundation Project for a Community College Core Curriculum became the prototype). Lehman received a large FIPSE grant to evaluate its core program (originally created with an NEH as I recall).

I do believe that this kind of core would be exciting and different. Rather than being a weak shadow of Brooklyn College or Lehman's core, a methodological core would place its college at the cutting edge of developments in core curriculum. It would be something unique and potentially highly influential.

PAT COLGATE, CHADRON STATE COLLEGE, NEBRASKA

If any value is to come from such reports as "A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform," "A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century," and the current reports from our profession, change must occur. All the pages and volumes of rhetoric, all the research studies and findings, all the good intentions for quality education are and will be wasted if change does not occur. The need for change and the topic of change have long been a matter of concern for mankind. Early in the sixteenth century, Machiavelli was concerned about change. He stated: "It must be considered that there is nothing more difficult to carry out, nor more doubtful of success, nor dangerous to handle, than to initiate a new order of things."

Mark Twain allegedly said that "People would sooner die than change, and most do." Organizations also die from the inability to change. In a society requiring appropriate and timely innovation in academic organizations, the success and failure of each institution depends on an understanding and management of the change process... One does not bring about change for change's sake, but an organization does change when such actions will meet the current demands and make curricular innovations more effective.

Academia has always had to deal with change, but the nature of change confronting the profession at the close of the twentieth century seems to be greater than ever before. Both external and internal forces are converging on colleges advocating curricular change. Colleges must develop a system to manage curricular change. Otherwise the external forces will result in inappropriate changes while failing to make the appropriate ones. Without managing present and future curricular change, a negative atmosphere and a strong resistance to change will result and progress toward a fully recognized profession will not be possible in this or the next generation.

Faculty are not hesitant to change because of their unique role definition. ***Rather, they find change disturbing, as does everyone, because it involves novelty.*** Novelty, in turn opens us up to surprises (including unpleasant ones) and uncertainty about whether we can perform under the altered conditions.

The change need not even be as modest as teaching a new course... A new text book will do the job, as will a room one has never taught in before, the first meeting of the hundredth committee you have chaired, or a request to serve as a marshall at graduation. (Clark and Meloy, 1985)

WHY THE RESISTANCE TO CHANGE

John Steinbeck said it this way: "It is the nature of man as he grows older . . . to protest against change, particularly change for the better." Such resistance occurs in any endeavor, and as a basic human characteristic it must be dealt with when considering implementing any General Education innovations into our curricula. Before outlining methods to overcome the resistance to change, it is imperative that an understanding of the negative forces involved with change be identified. (OVERHEAD #1A)

Richie proposes reasons for resisting change:

1. Fear of Losing Control. Once a person learns how to do something, there is a strong incentive to keep doing it. Studies have shown that many elementary teachers value a quiet, orderly classroom more than student learning. Control over something which is partly irrelevant is preferred to a new, more relevant approach.

2. Misunderstanding. Faculty members lack, or fear the lack of, information.

of personal behavior (2) ***environmental factors,*** and (3) ***constituencies that may serve as impediments to curricular change.***
(OVERHEAD 2A)

1. Individual Personality Behavioral Impediments (4 of these)

   A. ***Fear.*** Many persons experience an inability to bring about change because of uncertainty of the outcome. It is easier to maintain the status quo because it is known and one retains a sense of control and experience. Change brings about the fear of a whole new set of environmental factors.

   B. ***Inertia.*** Faculty members experience difficulty tackling a large or complicated task and put it off and it is often not completed until the deadline suddenly approaches. The source of this sense of inertia is often not clear to the change agent, but it is important for the leader to bring it to light and reduce the sense of inertia. The old quote "revising a curriculum is like moving a grave yard" is a case of inertia thinking. . . There will be unpleasant items that must be uncovered - exposed - moved - and replaced, and the inertia is an understandable obstacle.

   C. ***Excessive Focus on Self.*** This resistance to change includes self-protection, self-interest, and self-perpetuation. "Self-protection" is seen where it appears a number of hours required or "owned" may be lost in the change, or a decrease of head count or credit hour production will result in a loss of power or funding. This "self-preservation" goes beyond the individual faculty members' classes to the departments', or divisions' or schools' own preservation. "Self-interest" will occur with a faculty member resisting a change because it might mean less visibility for his or her unique skill or strength. "Self-perpetuation" is the compulsion for educators to train students in their own image, rather than preparing them for future challenges.

   D. ***Lack of Vision.*** A professional with "lack of vision" when dealin with curricular reform is unable to conceptualize an adequate sense of the college's mission and transfer this broad mission to specific goals and objectives.

2. Organizational Barriers/Environmental Factors.

   A. ***Organizational Structure.*** The most obvious of these factors is the organization that is in place to manage the curriculum. Examples of organizational impediments include insufficient faculty to manage the curriculum, curriculum management units poorly placed in the school, a lack of access by curriculum managers to appropriate groups or administrators, and a lack of regard for desired curriculum change.

(OVERHEAD #2B)

   B. ***Information Availability.*** Another environmental factor that hinders curriculum change is the lack of access by the curriculum change agent to information upon which to base the General Education program decisions.

   C. ***Institutional Direction.*** Curriculum change cannot occur without being able to articulate an institutional sense of direction. A sense of direction involves creating and communicating a concept of what the future of education will be and what the curriculum must be to prepare the students.

3. Groups/Constituencies That May Impede Curriculum Reform.

   A. ***Administration.*** The first constituency that can be an impediment to curriculum reform is the administration itself, from the provost, to the dean, to the administrative staff and to the department chairs. The administration is usually a vocal, strong advocate of curriculum change but, it is the administration who must balance the request for curriculum change

3. Lack of Skill. If one has the skill, it is not hard to develop new knowledge. Without the skill, new information just adds to the problem. Some faculty members do not have, or think they do not have the skill to deal with new and challenging concepts.

4. Different Criteria for What Needs to be Done. Quite often the faculty do have skill and information but disagree with the direction of change. They often have a different vision for the organization than does the change agent.

5. Lack of Motivation. Faculty members who lack the drive to study new concepts, integrate new ideas, develop useful frameworks, develop answers to questions, or apply new applications are "retired on the job."

6. "If It Ain't Broke, Don't Fix It." This is sort of a natural law principle. Until something falls because of its own weight, leave it alone. This type of thinking leaves the professional educator, that thinks this way, at the tail end of our field rather than at the leading edge or at least up front.

7. Future Shock. When too much is expected of them, too many changes, too many demands, some faculty members just plain give up. They give up not because they can't see the needed change but because they are not able to discriminate between possible areas of focus or the pressures are just too great.

(OVERHEAD #1B)

8. Personal Vendetta. It is very easy to "punish" the leader responsible for the change just to be vindictive. Some people are willing to go down with the ship just so that the captain looks bad.

9. "Bean Theory." Tell a child not to stuff beans in his ears, and the child who never considered putting beans in his ear, will do it just because he was told not to. Some faculty need to assert their independence just to prove that no one can tell them what to do.

10. New Social Relationships. A change in social relationships creates a greater resistance to change than a change in a technical or work process function. A threat to a faculty member's social support system can result in many negative actions from the threatened individual.

11. Lack of Resources. Faculty members often feel that they are expected to make changes while still doing all their old work. Simply they feel "it will come out of their hides." When money, time, people, and equipment are lacking, changes that require these resources will be resisted.

12. Bureaucratic Hassle. Organizational mechanisms that are intended to be facilitating are often seen as impediments. Faculty members resist bureaucratic review and evaluation and often work at ways to go around the system. This is inefficient and results are often negative.

13. Last of Rewards. Faculty members may feel that they are "rewarded" for good research and "punished" for poor teaching. Therefore, they work just hard enough to avoid poor teaching and put their energies into the positive area of research. Professionals ought to do quality work, independent of formal awards, and many do, but the challenge is to make the rewards system work for, rather than against, purposeful change.

This discussion of the resistance to change would seem to appear to bring a negative aspect to the implementation of any curriculum innovation. It is not intended to give this impression, rather it is done to bring a focus to the many resistances that do and will exist, and thus minimize their negative impact on curriculum change.

Hershey identified potential impediments to curriculum reform in school of dentistry. He categorized his change impediments into three broad groups: (1) ***deficiencies or shortcomings***

against the availability of very limited resources. Their first questions are: Does it involve additional staff? What will it cost? Where can you cut? Can it be done somewhere else?

B. ***Curriculum Committee.*** The group most responsible for curriculum innovation quite often becomes the biggest impediment to curriculum change. The internal conflicts within the committee and the curriculum management bureaucracy often pose insurmountable difficulty for the curriculum change agent.

C. ***School Faculty.*** The faculty is the institution. Yet, the faculty is one of the major impediments to the General Education program. Personal, departmental and institutional goal conflicts occur all too frequently. Decreasing enrollments have resulted in fewer new faculty, thus reduction in new ideas, plus faculty burnout produce an environment less open to change.

D. ***Students.*** Although the students are the ones to benefit from curricular change, they are some of the first to oppose change. It is human nature to choose the urgent over the important, the technical over the conceptual, the fashionable over the tested and the efficient over the effective. Curriculum reform usually emphasizes the least attractive alternative in each of the paired choices and it's no wonder that the students are the most vocal against curriculum change.

(OVERHEAD #2C)

E. ***Other Constituencies in Higher Education.*** The institution's central administration, board of trustees, state normal boards, state higher education boards and state boards of education are not usually required to approve changes in curriculum, but they do. They become involved almost immediately and could serve as positive change agents, but more times than not, put up road blocks to any major curriculum revisions.

F. ***National Accreditation.*** The accrediting agencies can provide staff expertise, serve as information brokers, provide consultants and provide standards against which schools and programs can be measured. The site visits promote curriculum revision. But, these groups become impediments to curricular change when standards are too rigidly applied, inflexibility to creative change is carried out, or standards do not reflect the current needs of the profession.

G. ***Practicing Educators.*** The practicing professional should be involved in curriculum reform and we should benefit from their experiential perspective. An impediment arises when the practicing professional has not kept current, he/she will advocate for "The program I had was good enough. Look at me." These two extensive lists point out some of the resistances and roadblocks to curricular change. Following are some common responses that a change agent often will face:

- We've always done it this way, there's no need to change now.
- The other schools do it this way, there's no reason for us to be different.
- There isn't any money to support a new way.
- The administration won't support it.
- I've tried something like this before and it won't work.
- The board of trustees won't go along with it.
- It can't be done.
- I don't know how.
- I'm used to the way it was.
- But what should we change to?
- Our facilities won't support change.
- I like it the way it is.
- I'm not trained to do that.
- I'm too close to retirement to change now.

- We're throwing the baby out with the bath water.
- We tried that fifteen years ago and now we are coming back to it, . . . things just go in circles.
- Things are okay for right now and we'll begin plans to change next year.

Probably everyone can see herself or himself using the many defenses against change and probably have used more than one of the statements opposing change at one time or another. Change does not always come easy. In fact, it is often difficult. All change is stimulated by some condition . . . in some manner . . . and usually from outside the organization and is most often seen as a threat. There is no simple answer to bringing about change. Simply deciding that you want to change your curriculum to fit the needs of the twenty-first century does not mean it will occur.

OVERCOMING THE RESISTANCE TO CHANGE

Most educational experts advocate a continuing process of updating with major changes occurring only periodically; that way you are always in a change mode. Change is an ever present part of modern life.

(OVERHEAD #3)

You must be aware that the first task to accomplish before change can occur is to get everyone involved to recognize that there is a need for change. This can be accomplished by outside consultants, knowledgeable speakers, faculty retreats, accrediting visits, in-house research, and feedback from graduates and practicing professionals.

Four key points which must be considered are, the ***first*** being that ***leadership*** is crucial to overcome the resistance, and this leadership should emanate from the highest administrative level down through the person identified to lead the change process. ***Second,*** there must be a definite ***commitment*** that there will be an outcome to the change efforts. Something will be done. The ***third*** key point was that ***rewards*** are important to stimulate the change process and that these rewards should go beyond financial inducements. Faculty should also be given the pride of ***ownership,*** the benefit of full participation and involvement. Along with an appropriate awards system, ***adequate time and resources*** should be made available to allow the faculty to adequately attack the curriculum change. ***Fourth,*** changes, if they are to be implemented, ***must involve and be supported by*** the administration, department chair, curriculum committee, and the faculty. The dean must be committed to the curriculum change and guarantee that there will be change as a result of the groups' efforts.

Most change models seem to fit Lewin's change model: (1) unfreezing the old pattern, (2) obtaining a new pattern, and (3) refreezing the new pattern.

(OVERHEAD #4)

The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education (RDCTE) at University of Texas at Austin conducted three studies on change. These studies provided seven suggestions for implementing change:

1. Set Long-Term goals. Set out to be pro-active rather than reactive.
2. Establish Priorities. Make it clear what the functions of the unit are.
3. Stay on Top of Innovation. Know what the ramifications are before implementing change.
4. Consult and Collaborate with Faculty. Seek suggestions as well as reactions to propose changes from the faculty.
5. Make Decisions. Base your decisions on what is best for the school. Allow others to make decisions as long as they are within understood parameters.
6. Offer Support and Guidance. Realize that faculty will need your help and/or resources to implement change. Collect and use information from different sources to assist in the

change effort.

7. Be a Leader. Know what is going on. Make yourself visible. Constantly and consistently reinforce the priorities of the school--teaching, service and research. (Justiz, 1985)

(OVERHEAD #5)

Another analysis of successful change projects identified six conditions as predictive of effectiveness.

1. There was a strongly felt need, tension, or "hurt" that moved people to want to change.
2. The person advocating the change was highly esteemed by people involved.
3. The conceptualization moved from general proposals to specific plans and measurable goals.
4. The process increased the self-esteem of the individuals who were changing.
5. New social support systems were developed that reinforced new attitudes and behaviors.
6. The people involved moved from an external criterion to an internal motive for making the change.

These conditions imply a high degree of involvement, education, and problem solving by those involved in the change. Because of the individualistic nature of the faculty, one must develop a shared set of values and expectations around this continuing change process.
(OVERHEAD #6)

The Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) was based on research conducted on how schools might go about changing successfully. The model was developed on the following six principles.

1. ***Change is a process, not an event.*** One of the most persistent tendencies of those who do not appreciate the complexities of change is to equate change with handling over a new program,which is an event. This, in fact, was the false tenet on which improvement were based in the past. We now know that change is a process occurring over time, usually a period of several years. Recognition of this is an essential prerequisite of successful implementation of change.

2. ***Change is accomplished by individuals.*** A common notion in considering change is to think about it in ambiguous, impersonal terms. But change affects people, and their role in the process is of utmost importance. Therefore, individuals must be the focus of attention in implementing a new program.

3. ***Change is a highly personal experience.*** What is meant here is that individuals are different; people do not behave collectively. Each individual reacts differently to a change, and sufficient account of these differences must be taken. Some people will assimilate a new practice much more rapidly than others; some will engage in the process more readily.

4. ***Change involves developmental growth.*** Studies of change show that the individuals involved appear to express or demonstrate growth in terms of their feelings and skills. These feelings and skills tend to shift with respect to the new program or practice as individuals pass through an ever-greater degree of experience.

5. ***Change is best understood in operational terms.*** Professors, and others, will naturally relate to change or improvement in terms of what it will mean to them or how it will affect their current classroom practices. What changes in their own or their students' values, beliefs, and behavior will it require? How much preparation time will it demand? By addressing these and other questions in concrete, practical terms, facilitators can communicate more relevantly and reduce resistance to improvement efforts.

6. ***The focus of facilitation should be on individuals, innovations and the context.*** Too often we tend to see improvement in terms of a new curriculum, a new program or

package -- something concrete that we can hold onto. But in doing so, we forget that books and materials and equipment alone do not make change; only people can make change by altering their behavior. The real meaning of any change lies in its human, not its material component. Therefore, notions about the speed with which successful change can be accomplished, the specific actions needed to achieve it, and even the shape that implemented change will ultimately have to be altered along the way.
(OVERHEAD #7)

Ritchie, a professor of organization behavior at Brigham Young University, identified six criteria that mediate the effect of ***participation***. These are:

1. The individuals involved in the decisions for change must have the skills and information relevant to the decision under consideration.

2. The degree to which those involved in the process perceive that their involvement can really affect the outcome will determine their effort. No one wants to go through a process just "rubber stamp" a decision that has already been made.

3. The degree to which participants perceive that the contributions will be ***recognized and rewarded*** will determine their efforts.

4. The sense of ***legitimacy*** should be felt by all participants. Those involved in change need to know that they are not being used to advance someone's private agenda or that their efforts are being used to hurt someone else.

5. The degree of difference in work, status or expertise among participants will affect the efforts of all. The greater the distance among individuals, the less effective the work will be. They all need a sort of relative professional equality.

6. The degree of trust, honesty, and confidence between superiors and subordinates can either enhance or undermine the curriculum revision process.

These criteria will make the curriculum process more or less effective and they are basically at the control of the change agent.

(OVERHEAD #8)

Clark and Meloy provide a general summary of guidelines for managing change:

- Believe in yourself but don't take yourself too seriously. You can support the conditions for change in your school or college, but you cannot dominate or control the ***change*** process.

- Just as in the general admonition that followership empowers the leader, followship determines the scope and success of ***change*** ventures.

- Organizational structure and organizational goals seldom have anything to do with ***organizational change***. Do something and the structure and goals will fall into place.

- Almost nothing ***changes*** all at once or pervasively. Anything requiring the ratification and participation of the faculty as a whole is unlikely to occur. Atomization not integration is the friend of ***change***.

- You can't ***change*** on a shoestring. Resources deprivation does not promote innovation. To the contrary, it heightens fear, lowers self-efficacy, and provokes withdrawal.

- The best way to build a change-oriented school or department is to stimulate trials. Organizations learn how to ***change by changing***. A bias for action is a bias towar ***change***.

- You must find and nurture your intra-organizational ***change agents***. They are the key to organizational creativity.

- The credit for successful ***change*** must be laid at the door of the inventors and implementors; the blame must be assumed by the administration.

- No ***change*** is ever necessary or imperative - and certainly not now! Successful change agents are opportunists not true believers.

- Gathering evidence about the effect of ***change*** is not of sufficient importance to subvert the trial itself.

- ***Change*** has to be based on organizational strength. In the volatile change process period, self-efficacy is imperative. Organizational weaknesses have to be shored up before a change effort is mounted. (Clark and Meloy, 1985)

CONCLUSION

A number of potential impediments or resistances to change have been identified. This resistance will be there whether it be to change the locks on the doors or implementing a new General Education curriculum. An administrator who is responsible for being the change agent should be aware that these reactions toward change are there and are real.

This same administrator should be aware of the methods, models, procedures and designs outlined for overcoming the resistance to change. Only a clear understanding of how to deal with change will allow the change agent to bring about the significant changes that are going to be needed to make any changes in existing General Education programs.

CLOSING SECTION OF THE DISCUSSION: CLASS, GENDER, AND RACE: THE CONNECTING TASK OF NARRATIVE IN GENERAL EDUCATION

KENT MITCHELL, MIDDLESEX COMMUNITY COLLEGE

What I suggest is that positivist treatment of class, gender, and race is not brand new to the best thought. Instead, it is today's extension of precisely that thought and that is why such treatment and such issues will remain undeniable. It is presidents and eras and fads that come and go. The great thought - the full dignity of the OTHER, of otherness - is neither new nor old. It is nature and our nature. . . in that the mind's centrism always needs the reminder of the other, a kind of compensating perspective. Religions, art, rituals, and general education do this.

Moreover, each person, vertical and centrist, is also always tensed toward acceptance of the other. We all live here. Neitzsche knew this. As though what is vertical requires vertigo. In Bloom's book, THE CLOSING OF THE AMERICAN MIND, I think you feel this tension, this wrestling. Bloom opposed a mood of leftist, know-nothing fundamentalism, a mood of the horizontal only: anything goes. But many thoughtful and radical persons on the left never espoused the weathermen extreme; they were vertical, like Bloom, and fought for humane standards for all. We needn't stay distracted by Bloom's case study, eloquent as it is, because it simply isn't a study of what the whole case was. It was an honest and profound reaction to what happened in Bloom while he was at Cornell.

After credentials, historical authority for a positivist treatment, what does a narrative mood - individual, but connected events - tell us to do in class?

Here is a list - from various sources.

1. Arrange Gen Ed material by themes. Promote sustained experiences. A long narrative creates more sense.

2. Connect students' stories (written, spoken; a list of issues) to the texts and to issues in the world. In discussions and written assignments.

3. Ask students how they think they learn and how that might influence the class's format, (visual, collaborative, hands-on, note-taking).

4. Attach the "text" to the world. Connect to the world beyond class with interviews, letters, research of local issues, immigrants' experiences, guest speakers.

5. Try clusters: sequences of courses, thematically attached, with teachers in contact weekly meetings, and with students with each other for several classes. "Connected events," an interdisciplinary narrative.

6. Use field trips. Prepare students; focus them with questions they must answer. Again, connect all the events.

7. Deal with the content of general education, including race, gender, and class, in developmental courses. Students' sense of status is helped; and there is more possibility of instruction about thinking when the urge to think is present.

8. Use props. Objects, maps, ads - dramatic reality beyond the texts. Shawls, cigars, masks, food, skulls. Spectacle teaches.

9. Imagine and conduct thematic role-playing. Make the roles elevating, weighty. Example: a female judge listening to "his" male defense lawyer damage "her" credibility through sexual innuendos.

10. Understand the thought processes you ask for and the real effects of your questions. (Bloom's taxonomy is useful.) Ask students to understand these processes, too: "what does this question ask of me?"

11. Maintain a narrative between classes: summarize at the end, and forecast the next. As you begin the next class, ask students to help you review the previous class.

12. Read toward certain themes: the passion you bring toward a social concern is valid. Mentoring about our own narratives in ways that are not extreme offer students examples of connectedness, of concern. Such examples last longer in the mind than anything else.

GENERAL EDUCATION AND THE SOCIAL DELIMITATION OF CLASS, GENDER, RACE AND ETHNICITY

RICHARD V. RAPACZ, MASSASOIT COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Community colleges are unique institutions. They represent the world's first effort to open access to higher education to all who have completed secondary school. For some peculiar reasons, this phenomenon is treated casually in this country, as though it were a minor achievement, or insignificant challenge. There is virtually no great public recognition of how extraordinary this phenomenon is. Nor is there a great rush by our colleagues in social sciences to examine the contributions of community colleges to economic growth, enhanced democratic polity, or heightened cultural and aesthetic norms. Though I believe these contributions are very great indeed, there is an astonishing lack of hard data to support my beliefs. There isn't much common publicity about it either. Even our own colleagues in community colleges are barely aware of the historical significance of their own work.

This curious silence probably exists for several reasons. The greatest honor and recognition has always been given to prestigious institutions, the Ivy colleges and the great state universities. Modeled after German and English universities and colleges, they serve to create new knowledge through research in disciplines, or they serve to educate elites. Both functions are attended by much hoopla and celebration. There is much power and wealth attached to both these accomplishments. Community colleges don't do either of these two things. To attempt to compete in this historically-rigged social game only helps to relegate community colleges to the lower orders in higher education, and it thrusts us into the anonymous oblivion of the socially unrecognized. Many of our colleagues want very badly to play these old games and they help us to be losers. They hunger for a prestige which is outmoded and persists only through inertia and ignorance. General education is the primary medium in which this game is played. There are at least two principal reasons for losing this game. The social characteristics of our students, and the elite focus of the subject matters and disciplines we teach them, pre-determine our loss.

Our students are mostly poor or they don't know how poor they are. They are women who have been denied higher education by virtue of their gender. They are of races which have experienced denial, or other ethnic groups similarly blocked from access. They are rarely, if ever, mentioned in the social columns of the ***New York Times,*** the ***Boston Globe,*** or the ***Washington Post.*** We don't get much publicity or recognition there. Other people do. Their colleges are usually highlighted in the articles, whether it's a wedding announcement or an obituary. As it is in the social columns, so it is on the business pages. Our graduates, and consequently our community colleges, don't get Andy Warhol's couple minutes of fame.

The ultimate denial for our students are the college subject matters or disciplines against which they are thrown, usually in general education. Some slip through this net and aren't caught. They are our dropouts. Those that graduate are of the right size. They have been puffed up enough, frequently through our professors exertions or their own, that they don't slip through the mesh. They get better jobs, or else they transfer and get even better jobs. They are usually identified as our successes. In the larger social game, they will rarely make the newspapers.

You probably believe that what I've said so far marks me as a depressed, and depressing cynic. That's not at all true. I believe that post-industrial countries, like our on, are in the process of changing the game. They are creating a new game, with new rules. I am optimistic about community colleges, and the prospects for their students. Our economy, our global economics, the paralysis of our intellectuals, arts, and politics, all make imperative the construction of a new game. Some people are already making up the new rules and outlining the shape of the game. The game has a lot more winners. It is much less of a zero-sum game, that old game in which some had to lose so that some could win. The existence of community colleges is testimony to the birth of a new game. If more of the staff and faculty were aware of it, we could accelerate the growth of the new game and help give birth to a much better society and world.

The social experience of our students, delimited by class, gender, race and ethnicity could make them the stars in this new game, if we allowed it to happen. Their so-called handicaps would become prized aptitudes for the new skills and knowledge which need to be created. Unfortunately, right now, our subject matters and disciplines, particularly those which are enabling, like general education, are not so constituted that these handicaps can be transformed into useful knowledge and skill. Presently, useful knowledge and skills are defined by the rules of the old game. They usually require that students must abandon or forget their social experience, or themselves, in order to be successful in college, and in life--in order to be a winner. Blacks and other ethnic groups have been excluded from literature, history and drama. Also excluded, have been the enormous social contributions of the poor and women. These exclusions are obvious, and some minor repairs are underway. Others are not so obvious. The social sciences and sciences have largely been in the service of the old game. Forty years ago, C. Wright Mills decried the social impotence of method in social science, arguing that historical, longitudinal, and comparative elements had to have a greater place. These elements are part of the new epistemology of the new game. In that epistemology, the poor, women, blacks, and other ethnics have a much greater space. There is some progress in psychology, sociology and anthropology. Even a little in economics. But, not much.

In the arts, there has been a little progress in T.V. film, and drama, since John Osborne's ***Look Back in Anger,*** but not much. The fine arts, like classical literature, are hopelessly locked in the old game. In the new game, they will only be useful in reconstructing the experiences of the history of social change, and in the service of the archeology of knowledge. The sciences and mathematics have long been in the service of the old game, harnessed to inegalitarian production. But computers are changing mathematics, and global pollution is inspiring the new biology, chemistry, and physics. The poor, women, blacks and other ethnics are key players, primarily as victims, in these transformations. All that is needed is to make their social experience known. They have to reveal their story and their history. Right now, they are mostly mute. In order to learn to tell their story, they must learn to speak the language of those who made them mute. In order to learn to speak and express, they must enter the ethos of the very language which ensures their silence. To be seen, they must change their appearance. To be empowered, they have to forget. Those are the rules of the old game.

How can we, the staff and faculty of community colleges, help them to be heard, and seen so that all of us can profit from the new knowledge which must be created? There are a lot of things which could be done. There are other things which we ought to stop doing, because they make it impossible to do the things which should be done. So, what could be done?

We should honor the social experience of the poor, of women, of blacks and other ethnic groups in all our subject matters and disciplines. In the arts, the humanities, the social sciences, and sciences, this will require the writing of new syllabi, creating new courses, and reconstructing our disciplines and subject matters. This is not an impossible task, and it is made much easier if we encourage our students to help. Our teaching methods would have to change to allow that. As it is with bi-lingualism in language use, so our subject matters could become the interpretations of several worlds. They must be able to talk with people who appear in the ***Times*** and not forget or diminish the significance of their own experience. In solving problems in an interdependent world, insights derived from their social past will be proved invaluable. They should be encouraged, not only to remember, but should also be encouraged to bring their social perspective to all disciplines and subject matters. Does this mean that I have a romantic perspective of the lives of our students? Not at all. I know very well that much of their lives is filled with fear, emptiness, boredom, meaninglessness, despair, ignorance, inarticulateness, shallowness, parochialism, ethnocentrism, xenophobia, racism, sexism, the social timidities of class, etc., etc. But, there is much in their lives which is not. All of those qualities which are deterrents to social and personal growth should be studied for their sources, for exposure of those who profit from them. They can figure these things out, if they are encouraged to do so. More importantly, those qualities of their social experience which can be brought to bear on our subject matters and disciplines, in order to reconstruct them, should be nurtured.

Elite colleges, where our current subject matters are created and disseminated through research and publication, and then handed down to us, cannot perform this great, new, social role. They don't have the right students. Nor do they have a teaching faculty which might encourage students to participate more fully in the reconstruction of their own subject matters and disciplines. In the history of higher education, community colleges are uniquely placed for a new kind of research: for creating a sorely needed, new perspective of our traditional subject matters and disciplines. This is our research role. Who else could do it? We need to do it, and publish it. We need to obtain recognition for making articulate, those who could not speak. We need to let people hear them. We need to make them visible in the world. If we do this, however tentatively, however limited our achievements, we will obtain plenty of recognition for this mission.

Now, what should we stop doing? We should try to stop those practices which create and reinforce the delimitations of race, ethnicity, class, and gender. More specifically what? We should stop honoring those students who merely achieve well in their studies of traditional subject matters and disciplines. For example, traditional Honor Societies help to set us up to be losers in a stacked, old game, which is outliving its usefulness in history. They make our students mute. They extoll those who have been transformed. They dishonor the social experience of our students. They do not encourage bi-culturalism, much less the badly needed multiculturalism of our age. We need interpreters who can solve the problems of our times. Traditional Honor Students won't be much help. They won't be able to help community colleges, or those whom we serve. They couldn't, even if they wanted to help.

We need to stop defining general education through the traditional and conventional subject matters and disciplines. They are punitive to our students and dangerous in a new world. Our developmental courses, in particular, must not be pedagogical devices which produce social amnesia. Nor should they be the tired, old mechanisms for tracking into dead-end jobs.

We need to stop apologizing for the extension of general education, (if it is reconstructed), further into so-called career programs in community colleges. I know of no careers, worthy of the name, which will not demand workers with polyvalent skills in the future, and who will be citizens and parents capable of fully participating in a democratic polity, and nurturing creative, socially conscious children. Let us be imaginative about ways of combining general education with our specialized career courses. Let us stop pandering to students who "just came to college to get a job and learn a trade." We are supposed to be able to see farther than they can into their future. Let us stop propitiating the accrediting and licensing boards who demand more specialized, technical, and clinical courses. Our collective view, as a faculty, should be much larger than their vocation. In the long run, we will be doing vocational educators, and their students, a big favor as careers change more rapidly in the future.

This struggle for a share of the student's time in a two-year college, known as "turf war," affects all of us deleteriously. All of us know that most students in our open-admissions colleges must study for more than two years. They have a lot of catching up to do. It's a fraud to continue to depict our colleges as two-year schools. The fear that we'll lose them to four-year colleges, if we are forthright, is groundless. There is a much larger market for our services than we currently can accommodate if we are allowed to pursue a policy of aggressive recruitment. Our space limitations have little to do with need. And four-year colleges certainly don't want those students anyway. They wouldn't know what to do with them, even if they did want them, except to self-righteously flunk them out.

The competition for time is also frozen in a conceptual context which is defined by current student-professor ratios. Of course, "Writing Across the Curriculum" activities are difficult if there are thirty students in a class, and a professor teaches four classes. Who's got time to read that much, and also give individual counsel? "Across the Curriculum" activities take time, though they are excellent as a vehicle for getting more subject matters and skills out of a fixed period of time. This is also true of interdisciplinary courses. Reducing student-professor ratios would make such real time-saving devices more possible, and more could effectively be done with general education.

Ivy and elite colleges have a student-professor ratio which is three times lower than community colleges, and they aren't even open-admissions institutions. If these scandalous ratios were reversed, they would make much more pedagogical sense. However, pedagogical sense, or moral sense, or common sense is not at work in this phenomenon of oversized classes in community colleges. Nonsense is. Unfortunately, most college administrations, most faculty, and even most of the faculty unions, accept this condition. They call it "reality." This nonsense doesn't have to be "reality." It will be, though, if they believe this limited, so-called "reality" is the same as the larger social reality. It will remain their "reality", if they help reify it, rather than resist it.

I must now apologize to you for this polemic, but there is so much to be said about general education and the social delimitations of class, race, ethnicity, and gender. My strong language may have closed your ears early in my talk. I hope you heard some of what I said, and agreed with some of it too. This could have been a more properly academic paper, but writing it this way has allowed me to breathe freely and speak from my heart, hopefully tempered by sound academic knowledge and experience. I would be delighted to point to appropriate sources and research which support the views which I have expressed. There is sufficient proper documentation. I think you know that's not the problem. I look forward to your comments and questions. Thanks.

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT: AN ESSENTIAL COMPONENT OF A GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

LENORE R. GALL, BROOKLYN COLLEGE, CUNY

For a number of reasons, academic institutions have experienced difficulty in attracting faculty to teach general education courses. There are various reasons why. Enrollment in general education courses is typically high because often the courses are required of all students. Class size is large and students are diverse in background. This increases the time faculty spend in preparing pedagogical materials, grading examinations and counseling students. Further, it is often the expectation that these courses should be newly created by the faculty, not simply selected from existing courses or reinstituted from a previous list of course offerings. This consumes more time. In addition, faculty trained as specialists and not as generalists are reticent about teaching courses outside of their field because learning new literature and different pedagogical methods is required. Compounding the problem is the fact that faculty do not generally recognize teaching in non-specialized areas as important, thus teaching general education courses is sometimes frowned upon.

Furthermore, in academia, faculty do not gain national reputations or receive promotions because they are good teachers. The reward system primarily recognizes scholarly research in the form of publications and presentations at professional association conferences. Promotion and tenure are granted based on these criteria and to a much lesser degree on classroom teaching. Since teaching overall is not the primary consideration in the tenure/promotion process, faculty typically avoid being assigned general education courses. Yet, because the success of any general education program is contingent upon teaching, it has been argued that the core courses should be taught by all levels of faculty and not relegated to newly trained Ph.D's or junior-level faculty, as is too often the case. Unfortunately, neither junior nor senior faculty are typically interested in general education courses, they are generally too preoccupied with research.

The success of a core curriculum relies substantially on teachers who have mastered their material and enjoy teaching. Through their enthusiasm and expertise in presenting the material, students acquire an interest in various fields and will be more focused when selecting majors or electives. The perception that general education is difficult to teach because it is not discipline related (outside the specialty of a particular faculty member) will be dispelled if more attention is directed to the art of teaching, which provides extrinsic as well as intrinsic rewards.

Faculty development programs began in the 1950s. Activities typically included sabbatical leaves, financial assistance to attend professional meetings, released time to complete degree programs and special considerations to encourage publishing. These early efforts had no incentives or apparent concern to address teaching techniques. Efforts were individualized with little formal support for a comprehensive program. Faculty development, as described in the literature, primarily develops the individual's scholarly and publishing activities. There are few programs that assist faculty in developing courses and improving teaching techniques.

It was not until students began evaluating faculty in the 1960s and started demanding greater input in their education in the mid-70s that institutions developed programs designed to make college teaching more satisfying and hopefully more successful. Elaborate, as well as modest programs, were instituted with some financial assistance from outside funding agencies. Faculty development took many forms then, personal contracts, long-range career planning, instructional, curricular and/or personal development. Participation in these programs was typically by self-selection, and was directed towards personal professional fulfillment (research and publishing rather than perfecting the craft of teaching). The focus of this movement was to assist faculty in their profession so that the job would be more fulfilling and their careers more personally rewarding.

With fewer financial resources, American higher education continues to support faculty development because it would appear that faculty who are less mobile now than two decades ago, need to be revitalized, or "retooled,"[1]

Among other goals, the new faculty development programs seek to develop more effective teachers. As Gaff pointed out:

> faculty development programs give faculty a detailed understanding of how their instruction relates to the entire general education program but also assists them in acquiring the sensitivities and techniques to teach skills, explore values, foster the integration of knowledge or achieve the other purposes of general education.[2]

Through faculty development activities, instructors can improve their teaching skills and come to appreciate the value of general education courses. Faculty should be more receptive to teaching core courses if all instructional levels are required to teach in this area, thereby removing the stigma.

When an institution undertakes curriculum reform, the next logical step is to assist faculty in making the necessary adjustments and required changes. Faculty development programs are vital to this process.

The Brooklyn College faculty development program has addressed teaching styles and to a larger extent a beneficial consequence has been the strong collegial bonds that has developed among faculty. At Brooklyn College faculty are serious about their jurisdiction over the curriculum and its attendant activities. Therefore, from the inception of the core, faculty played a key role and have actively participated on the faculty development summer seminar committee which connotes a sense of faculty ownership.

Brooklyn College instituted faculty development seminars in the summer of 1982 (funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities) to convert a faculty of specialists into a coherent and integrated cadre of teachers committed to making a general education program work. The first seminar was structured to bring the core faculty together to learn about each other's courses and to seek ways to interrelate them.

This seminar ignited a spark that has not diminished over the years. Through the design of the seminar faculty got to know and respect colleagues in other disciplines and to know and respect the content and purpose of core courses other than their own. A strong bond of collegiality developed. In addition that seminar produced professors who had rediscovered the joys of teaching and a unity of purpose as they discussed the students they would teach and a concern about how best to help them learn.

Each year the summer seminar addresses different pedagogical methods and issues surrounding the core. In the second year the Department of Educational Services faculty who teach remedial, developmental and ESL courses participated in the program. Their presentation identified the problems of students in the classroom from listening to note-taking to discussion (this, of course, involved critical and analytical thinking). This presentation proved to be an invaluable resource for pedagogical techniques. This seminar emphasized the practical realities of classroom teaching -- how much could be taught and what techniques could be developed and shared -- to continue to make the core a vital, coherent and successful experience for all students.

Since the core is seen as "a work in progress" some faculty development seminars have helped to redefine the core, have addressed the problems with some of the courses offered in the core which has resulted in experimental sections of a particular core course versus the standard version of that course.

The core has further sparked the emergence of another core activity - the core "sampler series." This series highlights the master teacher and how he/she teaches a particular core course. For example a history teacher approaches his Core 4 (the History course) as a moot court. Students are given a problem to defend, the jurors (the remainder of the class) delivers a verdict. Discussion is lively and the students (either in a group or individually) work hard to prepare their arguments and presentations. Through the "sampler series" many innovative pedagogical methods have been demonstrated which many faculty have now incorporated in some of their courses. The core and its attendant activities have revitalized the faculty and helped in changing teaching techniques and provided alternative pedagogical methods.

The summer faculty development seminars are held for a three-day period and faculty are paid a small stipend for participating. A variety of tasks (in small work groups) are assigned to the faculty to generate discussion and have faculty interact with colleagues of different disciplines. These tasks have taken the form of faculty playing the role of students or addressing a particular issue relating to the core. Recommendations of possible solutions are presented to the larger group and discussed exhaustively. The experiential model for the seminars appear to be very effective.

Samplers, where a master teacher demonstrates his/her innovative method of teaching a course, have generated animated discussion and other methods of presenting course material. The use of visual aids, small group discussions, and writing assignments have given faculty ideas how they can rework some of their courses to get students more actively involved.

A subtle key component to the success of the faculty development seminars is the support of the highest academic officer. The former Provost was one of the architects of the Brooklyn College core, who also taught a core course and served on the first faculty planning committee that developed the summer seminars. Over the eight years that the seminars have been offered she has always been present and gave opening remarks. The same support is apparent with the new Provost who also teaches a core course.

Faculty development is approached very differently at Brooklyn College than it is outlined in the literature. The financial reward, in itself is unique, but shows that the institution has a commitment to the program and its faculty. This gesture indicates that the faculty are professional, their time valuable, and their involvement in trying to improve themselves equally important and should be recognized. Recently, because of dwindling funds, faculty have not always received stipends to participate in seminars, but the attraction to the program has not diminished.

All professional levels of faculty participated in the faculty development program and were viewed positively for having participated. Because the format is participatory, faculty reported being intimately involved and having learned something from attending the seminars, which enhanced their knowledge and performance in the classroom. This exposure also made faculty more aware of what was taught in core courses and how it was taught.

Faculty have found the collegiality that emerged from the seminars have been central to the success of the core, boosted morale and enhanced networking. It is believed that the seminars have fostered respect for their colleagues, nurtured a college-wide community spirit and created a unified sense of mission.

The seminars also provided an opportunity for faculty to reconsider their teaching techniques, and enhanced the status of being a good teacher. Many faculty have commented on how their own teaching styles have changed by being more imaginative, or learning new techniques to use in the classroom. As a result, besides lecturing, some faculty started dividing students into groups, or used discussion teams and visual aids.

The samplers gave faculty the opportunity to demonstrate how they approached certain course topics or to experiment with certain diverse pedagogical techniques. Faculty also used the samplers to test new teaching methods. When faculty development has centered around curricular reform it has generally emphasized how to reorient the faculty or retool faculty for the changed curriculum but rarely have the side benefits been discussed in the literature.

Although Brooklyn College faculty were not opposed to the seminars, some did not feel the faculty development seminars had an effect on their teaching because they were already "good" teachers. On the other hand, some indicated that through the faculty development seminars they had become much more sensitive to students.

The Brooklyn College faculty are not unique in believing that a developmental seminar is not necessary for them. Faculty development literature supports that stance. It is noted in the literature that even the average teacher thinks he/she is good and does not need to participate in a program. However, it was further supported that faculty admitted after having participated they "learned something."

---

[1]Howard R. Bowen, Jack H. Schuster, *American Professors: A National Resource Imperiled*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), p. 134.

[2]Jerry G. Gaff, *General Education Today: A Critical Analysis of Controversies, Practices and Reforms* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983), p. 128.

THE ROLE MODEL PROBLEM IN GENERAL EDUCATION

DEREK HARRISON, MONROE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

We hardly need empirical studies to tell us what we have learned directly from our experiences on both sides of the classroom: students' learning is greatly enhanced by their identification with their teachers -- what we might call the role-model phenomenon. It is fair to assume that many of us chose the profession we follow today because we found in one or more of our own teachers a model for our own future. However, it's also fair to assume that the teacher who served as our model was not a teacher of "general education"; he or she was teaching history, or literature, or chemistry, and our identification with that person, along with the impetus it gave to our learning, resulted from our seeing him or her in that more specialized role. We need to ask, then, if there is any possibility that the role-model phenomenon can exist within the context of general education, and, if so, what the necessary conditions for its existence would be. Whatever may be the answers to those questions, I want to argue first that we cannot offer ourselves as general education role-models for our students until we first come to terms with our own identification as generalists in an otherwise specialized educational setting.

• • • •

A few years ago, a former student secured her first full-time professional position. Along with a desk, a computer, a secretary, and the other necessary tools of the modern professional, her new job provided her with something I have never possessed in over two decades as a college teacher: a business card. It said: "application specialist." Specifically, it was the second word of the title that caught my attention, with its suggestion that she had leaped to the status of "specialist" in one bound of employment. My reaction to the card was a mixture of pride and bewilderment, with special emphasis on the latter. To the extent that I was bewildered, it owed to my asking myself just what I could put on such a card of my own, just how I could identify myself if called upon to do so.

What is the proper professional identification for one who has spent over 25 years studying and teaching the humanities as part of general education? Along strictly logical lines, the answer is obviously a "humanist." It needs hardly to be said that a card identifying oneself as a humanist would be laughed out of the hotel lobby. And if laughter were not the response, it might be because that sort of professional identification would be taken by some as the weak excuse of one who has done nothing of any importance, or by others as the arrogance of suggesting that only those who work in the humanities are "believers in humans," which is the literal meaning of humanist.

Calling myself a humanist, then, will not do. The real difference between my student's business card and any that I might present is the difference between her "specialist" and the word that is generally taken as its opposite: "generalist". Generalist is the word that would most honestly represent my professional identity, for better or worse. And it is because that word seems, from almost any angle, to be for the worse rather than for the better that I would be troubled by having to thus identify myself in a world that demands much more specific identities.

To be sure, the world of education differs from the worlds of business, or health care, or government service, in respect to the need for identification. For one thing, educators do not usually suffer the inclination to dignify their occupation with special titles on cards. Those who do, I have found, are usually also those who have their own reasons for wanting to identify more closely with the world outside of academe. Too, educators tend to find an identity in their fields of study, an identity that extends backwards from their present occupation through the years spent studying as a major in that same field. Thus a professor of psychology is as much as a "psychologist" as he or she is a professor and, to give a twist to Sartre, essense thus becomes existence. So much the better, then, for psychologists, nuclear physicists, even "educationist." But where does all this leave the professor of general education?

My interest in the identity problems of the humanist/generalist is heightened by the fact, if one takes seriously a continuing theme in educational theorizing, there should be no problem at all. The theme I refer to is the recurrent call for "general education", trumpeted, among other things, as an unquestioned need for the too-soon-specializing undergraduate and as the basis for an enlightened citizenry. General education has been the subject of president's commissions, empirical studies, of books, articles, even whole journals. It adapts itself easily to ruminations on values education, attacks on benighted administrations, applications for funding, calls for integrative education, and harkenings to some golden age in higher learning. Hardly a day goes by, one can assume, without a speaker somewhere calling once again for a renewal of the effort toward general education.

The gap between rhetoric and reality, however, yawns ever wider: lip service to general education has had little impact on the trend toward specialized curricula and no impact at all on the identification problems that plague the generalist. But if theorizing about the ideal curriculum does not do the job, one might take some comfort from the high praise accorded the generalist throughout history. In discussing the Greek concept of a.ete (sometimes translated as excellence), H.F. Kitto claims that it suggests a respect for the wholeness of life and learning; general studies were preferable to specialization. That classical preference for generalists re-emerged in the concept of the "renaissance man," an ideal suggesting that one should be able to undertake a nearly-comprehensive variety of intellectual goals.

The nineteenth century's dawn of industrialization brought with it the beginnings of specialization, but the value of general learning was not therefore lost. Consider Emerson's analysis in "The American Scholar."

> Man is not a farmer, or a professor, or an engineer, but he is all. Man is a priest, and scholar, and statesman, and producer, and soldier. In the <u>divided</u> or social state these functions are parcelled out to individuals, each of whom aims to do his stint of the joint work, whilst each other performs his....the individual, to possess himself, must sometimes return from his own labor to embrace all other laborers. But unfortunately, this original mist, this fountain of power, has been distributed to multitudes, has been so minutely subdivided and peddled out, that it is spilled into drops, and cannot be gathered. The state of society is one in which the members have suffered amputation from the trunk, and strut about so many walking monsters -- a good finger, a neck, a stomach, an elbow, but never a man.

Emerson's analysis is notable not so much for its defense of generalism as for its attack on specialization. As such, it sets a direction that has been followed in our own century. That direction includes some interesting paths. Even before World War I, Whitehead, as part of his discussion of the "fallacy of misplaced concreteness," noted that education was tending to send the intellectually promising toward more and more specialized careers. The result, he argued, would be that the intellectually weaker would be left to do the everyday work, the work that would result from the specialized discoveries of the experts. The crisis would come when the generalist-integrators fall so far behind that they are no longer capable of knowing the value of the specialist's findings. If those findings cannot be realized and coordinated, we end with a kind of stalemate, a failure of progress.

Whitehead was at least half correct; progress we continue to have, but coordination we have not. And if he is correct that specialists will outrun generalists, he is on weaker ground with his concern that generalism would fall to the intellectually inferior. On the contrary, Buckminster Fuller argues, society's real leadership comes from those who have received a general and

integrated education. Specialists are created so that they can serve the leadership. This, for Fuller, makes specialization nothing more than a fancy form of slavery, under which the specialist gains security as well as the illusion that he is culturally preferred.

The idea of the generalist as integrator is echoed in Fritjof Capra's argument that the study of ecosystems shows us the essentially cooperative relationships between living organisms. Contrasted to Social Darwinism, which sees life in terms of struggle and competition, this view sees generalism as the more appropriate response to the need for symbiotic, interdependent co-existence. Further, Capra connects generalism to systems theory, which stresses adaptation, creativity and interplay. Rather than simply adapting to their environment, organisms co-evolve with it. We are, in the words of Ervin Laszlo, "part of an interconnected system of nature, and unless informed 'generalists' make it their business to develop systematic theories of the patterns of inter-connection, our short-range projects and limited controllabilities may lead us to our own destruction."

Although in less theoretical terms, the same point is made by Alvin Toffler. Society, he claims, is in the process of reconsidering the role of the specialist/professional. The old rule "specialize to succeed" is no longer unquestioned. "Today, in every field, including politics, we see a basic change in attitude toward the expert. Once regarded as a trustworthy source of neutral intelligence, specialists have been dethroned from public approval. They are increasingly criticized for pursuing their own self interest and for being incapable of anything but tunnel vision." Running through the predictions of Toffler (and for that matter of most other futurists as well) is a recurring call for "holism", that is, generalism, in every field of endeavor.

From Plato onward, education theorists have made the same point. The higher cognitive skills, according to Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, are analysis and synthesis, the results of general education. Piaget's idea of learning was that it is an evolutionary, organic process, one of assimilating new information into what the mind has already synthesized.

With endorsements and arguments from such a variety of philosophers, social critics, and education theorists, why should anyone be troubled at the thought of identifying oneself as a generalist? Certainly it has little to do with the putative business card, except insofar as such cards are one more way of claiming the status of a professional. The nagging truth is that to claim the title of generalist seems to suggest a lack of professionalism, in the same way that the old "jack of all trades" could not make a claim to professional expertise in any single area. It is expertise that is wanted in contemporary society, so much so that one often needs only to claim it in order to have it. While that may work in almost every other field of endeavor, it does not work for the humanist-generalist, whose expertise remains in doubt.

Equating professionalism with specialized expertise is not to be derided, especially since most work is done best by those who have specific professional training. Basic to our desire to have specialists work on our bodies, or our homes or cars, is the idea that they are more likely to know the real problem, and can be trusted to fix it. Still, the connection of special expertise to professionalism is secure only in that it gives status to those who claim both these attributes. When viewed from other angles, its validity becomes questionable. Let us, for starters, consider the matter of opposites. The opposite of specialization is generalization; the opposite of professional is amateur. Are we therefore to conclude, if professionals are noted primarily for being specialists, that amateurs are generalists? That will hardly do: one claims amateur status precisely with regard to a specialized activity, such as pole-vaulting or chess-playing, just as easily as one claims professional status for that same activity. The distinction between amateur and professional lies elsewhere than in the specialist-generalist dichotomy; it lies, for some, in the matter of whether or not one is paid (amateurs, as the word's Latin root suggests, do it for love, while professionals have pecuniary interests in their specialty), and for others in criteria such as memberships in organizations, sanctioned competition, licensure and the like.

To pursue our connection further; if "specialized professional" seems to be a tautology, and if "amateur generalist" make no sense, we are left with the question of whether there is a possibility

of being a "professional generalist." The first difficulty here is with the meaning of each word. What constitutes true professionalism, as noted above, varies widely, and the debate over the meaning of the word professional is not limited to the Olympic Committee or the linguists. Even harder to define is the generalist. If this essay has so far failed to do so, it is because the word is usually defined in negative terms, if at all. One definition is "lacking in details, not specific"; another is "not precise." Such definitions help even less than those that see the generalist as "opposed to particulars" and the "opposite of specialist."

Perhaps a clearer, if more mundane, answer to the question of whether one can be a professional generalist can by found by asking whether the world actually pays people for acting (professionally) as generalists. Here, surprisingly, the answer comes back yes. In limited numbers, colleges and universities pay generalists; so do think tanks and other organizations which sometimes hire consultants to bring a generalist perspective to their problems. Never mind the relative dearth of generalist organizations, the lack of a generalist code of ethics, the failure of government agencies to provide licensing requirements for generalists -- being a generalist can pay, and insofar as it does that, it is possible to think of "professional generalist."

But something seems wrong in this oversimplified and slightly craven association of professionalism with money. The problem is that, while it is true that institutions of various sorts pay generalists, it is not usually the case that the individual is initially hired as a generalist. How often do we see ads for tenure-track positions in generalism? No, one is hired on the basis of some speciality, and the most any institution of higher education will claim to want beyond that is phrased something like "must be willing to work in interdisciplinary situations," whatever that might mean in actual practice. Similarly, think tanks bring together people who are first economists, urban planners, or military strategists; only after that will they perhaps cause these people to interact as generalists. Consultants too are hired for their alleged special expertise, whatever they end up doing of a later, more general sort.

Which leads to the necessary conclusion of these speculations on the possibility of working as a professional generalist: one must first pass oneself off as a specialist. This seems an odd sort of game. Generalists exist, and generalists are wanted in certain circumstances, and still they will, if circumspect, identify themselves as specialists first. That they must do so results from the fact that society actually wants some generalists, but asks for specialists instead. If the generalist thus ends up wearing a disguise part of the time, there are several reasons. One is that specialization implies a sense of discipline, manifested in the ability to concentrate on very specific problems, while generalization may imply the lack of that same discipline. In a society noted for its lack of discipline in other areas, there is a tinge of hypocrisy in this requirement, not to mention a failure to recognize the perhaps greater amount of discipline required in concentrating on the act of integration.

The other reason has to do with competition. It is by now accepted that a good reason for digging oneself into an increasingly esoteric specialty is that the more specialized it becomes, the less likely is there to be any other person involved in that exact specialty. The result: no competition. The specialist who is more successful at this game is then able to say, "Yes, so-and-so is doing some similar work, I suppose, but it's really very different from what I'm doing right now." This is not to say that all specialists are necessarily afraid of competition; they just needn't be bothered with it. The generalist may or may not be afraid as well, but the competition exists on every side, coming variously from other generalists and from specialists who recognize an easy target when they see one.

Neither the charge of lacking discipline nor the prospect of competition can deter a true generalist. At the same time, every generalist is now and then tempted to find refuge in some alleged speciality, if only for the sake of identification in the fewest possible words. Sitting in a London pub some time back, I fell into a conversation with an American graduate student. "What do you teach?", he wanted to know. "Philosophy," I answered. "Well, what's your specialty?" was the next, and expected, question. "Ethics." I set myself for a question calling for a further refinement of my expertise, though in this case it never came. Another time I would have had to

narrow it to "applied ethics," and from there perhaps to ethics applied, let us say, to the issue of nursing autonomy.

What this kind of conversation shows me is that it is actually very easy to get specialists off one's back, and one need not even lie to do so. But if that conversation came easily enough to me, it makes me wonder just how many times I have myself been fooled by generalists masquerading as specialists. Just how many generalists are out there? And assuming that there are many of us, should we establish a professional organization to gain respect from the public, or support groups along the lines of Kleptomaniacs Anonymous?

Lest anyone take these last questions seriously, let me conclude by noting that for some there is a sense that the party is almost over for the generalists in any event -- if ever there were a party. The generalist tendency in higher education may be a generational one, a generation of generalists, as it were. It would appear to be another by-product of the sixties, now moving through the work force, creating its own work largely within the tolerant halls of academe, but destined to disappear within a few decades. History, according to this argument, may look back on the "lost generalists" with bemusement or with pity, but that history will be written, of course, by specialists.

Finally, I would like to suggest that the best way to mediate the generalist-specialist difference and to affirm a positive identity may be found in the claim of a generalist colleague who says, "Well, I am a specialist -- I specialize in generalities." Nothing defensive about that, for it is half joke and half claim to an area of specialty after all. At least at present, and especially on the lower levels of undergraduate education, there is still room for those who specialize in generalities. Leaving aside the question of whether this activity is actually a profession of the kind that merits a business card, we can take some comfort in that.

• • • •

To conclude these observations, we need to ask again the question with which we began: what are the necessary conditions for us to become role models as generalists. Two come to mind.

One is that we convince our students that the various sources I referred to earlier are correct when they argue that the most valuable education is integrative education. Most of our students have not, in their earlier years, been given that impression, rather quite the opposite. In order to convince them, we should first recognize that students do in fact know a great deal of information; what they lack is the ability, or I might even say the habit, of integration. As a result, what they know rattles around without reference points other than perhaps pop culture and television. We, and our classrooms, must become those reference points, in the role model of integrators. Being ourselves the products of specialized training and, as argued earlier, being to some extent reluctant for professional reasons to identify ourselves as generalists, it is not always easy to offer ourselves as role-model integrators. It requires imagination, vulnerability, and a willingness to come out from behind our specialized backgrounds. But we also know a great deal, and we are much more in the habit of making connections. Passing along the habit of integration until it becomes a normal part of our teaching and their learning may be the best thing we can do.

The second condition is that we create an environment in which students see general education as the human side of education, (education, to paraphrase Schumacher, as if people mattered), as opposed to the occupational emphasis of specialization. Specifically, in this regard, a couple of reminders are in order. One is that the modern world sees us changing our occupations three-to-four times, while we remain at all times humans. Students need to be reminded of that. Another is that the average age of the community college student is now 28, which means that they have lived through many experiences that can help them to integrate general education into the human perspectives it deserves. We need to remind ourselves of that.

A final reminder is that, at least within the humanities, a retreat into specialization carries with it what I call the "snob factor," the impression that the instructor possesses esoteric

knowledge and tastes which are beyond the reach of the student. We may do that more often than we realize, doing damage both to the concept of general education and to our attempts to humanize it for our students. The role which we should properly assume, then, is one in which general education is offered as integrator and humanizer, in which we offer ourselves as integrators and humanizers, not specialists hung up on the concept of professionalism. That's a role that our students can, once they catch on to it, see as a valuable model.

ALTERNATE LEARNING STRUCTURES TO STRENGTHEN GENERAL EDUCATION FOR BUSINESS STUDENTS

Meryl Sussman, LaGuardia Community College, CUNY

The Center for Business Careers and Values (CBCV) is a pilot model of an alternate structure for the freshman year experience at LaGuardia Community College. Now in its second year of operation, CBCV can be described basically as a "minicollege" for entering students selecting business majors and placing at the highest level of remediation or better in math and English. Through CBCV, we have learned much about the appeal, operation, success and problems inherent in a design of a small self-contained community within the larger community of the college.

For many years, LaGuardia faculty and administrators had been concerned with several critical problems beyond the chronic problem of remediation. The attrition rate of incoming freshmen was high and rapid; estimates were that 30% of our incoming freshmen did not register for the second quarter. This was true across skill levels: thus, we were losing 30% of our best-prepared as well as our most under-prepared freshmen within 10 weeks! Our intervention systems could barely identify the students with difficulties before they disappeared.

One critical problem was that students did not perceive a coherent design to the degree program they must take. Business students have a narrow definition of what is "relevant" to their preparation for careers. They of course do not perceive that math and writing courses or even computer courses have any relevance to their career plans or life goals. Students see their courses as discrete units. Thus, it does not seem inappropriate to a student to take part 2 of a two part course sequence six months after the first part.

Another important discovery is the discrepancy between the seriousness with which the institution regards the students' selection of majors and the arbitrary and often-misinformed basis upon which the students make their choices. A student counselor reports that students change their major an average of 5 times. The changes are usually prompted by academic difficulties. Despite all this, the institution steers students rapidly into specialized career skill courses.

Finally, we discovered that, by and large, our students function in isolation from each other. As a fairly large commuter school, we serve all of NY. Our students have tremendous family and financial responsibilities which make it necessary for them to take a compact schedule of classes and to immediately hurry off to work or home to resume the rest of their lives. Few of them have a quiet place to study; many of them have little time to study. Few develop a supportive network at the college to help them study, to share notes should they have to miss class, to work together on projects or difficult assignments.

CBCV was developed to address these problems. However, the faculty and administrators who developed CBCV were required to work under specific constraints. First, the program could not be more costly to run than the college's general academic program; secondly, the program had to fit within the curricular requirements of existing business majors and options already offered by the college.

Within these limitations, CBCV presents to its students a prestructured curriculum which, over three quarters, offers courses normally required of business area majors: the required English and math sequences, introductory courses in business, computers and either social science or economics, a freshman seminar which orients the student to college life, and Coop Prep, the introductory course to the required coop experiences. What differs is that the schedule has been prearranged so that all CBCV students will be taking the same courses during the same quarters and will be in sections exclusive to CBCV. The courses were selected so that fundamental skills are mastered early, so that students take survey courses in a variety of fields before they begin specializing (to make it easier for students to switch majors should they desire to do so), so that students see familiar faces in virtually all their classes to encourage the development of friendships and support networks more quickly.

Certain additional characteristics are unique to the program. A specially-designed Career Development Seminar introduces students to assessment tools and interest inventories to explore the "fit" of their career choices with their interests and aptitudes. Throughout the CBCV program, there is an attempt to focus on the act of valuing and the development of values, and their impact on personal choices, as well as business and government policies. Certain values were selected to thematically unify the program across curricular areas. These values included: civil rights, the self vs. others, democracy, independence vs. dependence. The discussion of values culminates in the third quarter with a rigorous new course called: ***Philosophy, Value and Business Ethics.***

Another major characteristic of CBCV is the emphasis on group work and collaborative learning as preferred pedagogical techniques. These approaches were formalized in the development of "study groups" for the core courses (Intro. to Business, Intro to Computers, Intro to Social Science or Economics I) based on the work done with calculus study groups at the University of California at Berkeley by Uri Treisman. There was also an attempt to build in sequencing of instructors: wherever possible, instructors move with their classes to the next level course in math, English and counseling. This enables students to develop stronger relationships with faculty and to feel more comfortable in courses which generate a lot of student anxiety.

The chart below shows the CBCV program for the first three academic quarters:

Quarter 1
English 099 or English 101 (Expository Writing)
Math 099 or Math 110 (Algebra)
AMM 101 (Introduction to Business) with Study Group
Freshman Seminar

Quarter 2
English 101 or English 102 (Writing through Literature)
Math 110 or Math 200 (Precalculus)
BDP 100 (Introduction to Computers) with Study Group
Career Development Seminar

Quarter 3
English 102
Math 200
SSI 100 (Introduction to Social Science) or SSE 101 Introductory Economics) with Study Group
Philosophy, Value and Business Ethics
Cooperative Education Preparation (Coop Prep)

CBCV opened for business in Fall 1988. We learned almost immediately that this type of prepackaged curriculum had a lot of appeal to the entering freshman. (Our schedule was designed to be appealing: we chose to offer a 4 day week with classes running from 9:00 am to 2:30 pm.) Faced with the difficulty of putting together a reasonable schedule of appropriate classes on their own, most eligible students elected to join our program. This willingness on the part of students to "buy" a prepackaged program raises some philosophical questions about students learning to make choices and becoming independent. However, considering the complexity of registering, the fear of entering a new institution (and being perhaps the first family member who has been to college) and the fact that we as faculty have some experience and knowledge on which to base a recommended course of study, presenting well-conceived educational packages to new students allows us to foster general education while assuaging the fears of the students.

Our goal of developing a sense of community among the students succeeded more easily and quickly than we thought possible. Within one or two weeks, students felt they belonged together. There was a strong social pull to stay with the group. This was immediately seen in the lower attrition rate—students did not choose to leave. Unfortunately, academic attainment did not similarly improve. Thus what eventually happened was that students were ***required*** to leave because of poor academic

performance. What had developed was a student-centered community reflective of the standards of 18 year olds. Mediocre academic performance was acceptable. Getting by was OK. The narrow view of what was educationally important was defined by the students.

Faculty became very conscious of the problems they experienced with the student-defined community. Many faculty were forced to admit that they had built their classroom procedures on the typically passive students they usually taught. While many faculty could point to instances where the sense of community among the students was demonstrated in positive ways: students encouraging each other to stay in school; students discussing how to work on projects or to prepare for tests, faculty members were more often upset by the adolescent behavior.

Why the faculty were not part of the community taught us a lot about the dynamics of a program of this type. At a daylong conference of CBCV faculty held last June, faculty discussed their concerns. They pointed out that they felt that the program had been designed from the top down. It met administrative concerns first. Faculty felt they had to fit their interests within a predefined framework. In addition, many faculty felt they were asked to be innovative and to work across curricular areas with little training and less time. Some were shocked at the immaturity of the students they faced ; they were not used to having classes so homogeneous in age and career goals. There was also an underlying concern with making the program succeed—thus, some faculty felt reluctant to be as demanding and firm with the student group as they would typically be. There was general agreement that the themes were too diffuse to work well across the curricula.

This fall, we again recruited for our program and we again found the program had great appeal to entering freshmen. While we are offering the same program as last year, we have made some immediate short-term changes and are planning long-range changes. This year, faculty meet regularly and share concerns with student problems, strategies to deal with these problems, and information about course activities. Interestingly, as soon as the students knew that faculty were meeting (that is, were a community also), student behavior settled down.

Student counselors have proven to be an essential and central part of the faculty team. They reflect back to students faculty concerns and perceptions and alert faculty about students' concerns and problems. Counselors actively work with students early in their college career to develop more positive ways to handle the stresses and pressures of college.

At the same time, CBCV faculty are participating in a series of seminars to learn about learning communities, collaborative learning and active learning strategies. The participating faculty are being encouraged to "brainstorm" about new course pairings, cross-curricular structures, or any other innovative curricular development they wish to pursue. This year there is administrative support—both financially and morally — for faculty-developed innovations in curricula under the aegis of CBCV. There is a commitment to allow CBCV to serve as a "laboratory" for curricular and pedagogical experimentation.

CBCV has demonstrated that it is possible to create a minicollege structure with the larger college community that will enable students to quickly develop a sense of personal involvement with peers in an educational setting. This could be done without extraordinary expense or difficulty for the institution. At the same time, CBCV underscored that contiguity does not mean connection; that the institution needs to support faculty in time and dollars--and empowerment--to create new ways to combine general education and career education within this smaller intimate community.

GENERAL EDUCATION AS A WAY NOT TO PULL THE LEG OF THE STUDENT BODY

SILVIO TORRES-SAILLANT, HOSTOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE, CUNY

Despite all the discrepancy perceptible in the discourse on education from Plato's ***Republic*** to Allan Bloom, one generalization at least seems warranted: school ought to prepare students for membership in a given society. There is hardly any room for disagreeing that in the early stages of a person's growth, school--at the primary, intermediate, and even secondary level--serves as an arena for socializing individuals. At these stadia of human development, then, the function of education as social training is easy to accept. But it appears that even at the post secondary level, "the campus is one of the critical locales of identity formation" (Clark, 1968:515). Indeed, when in 1656 Harvard College was granted its charter, the school's expressed aim, "to develop a disciplined mind and instill moral values" in students, assumed that at the college level students are still being shaped morally as well as intellectually (Withers, 1987:16).

What has given the philosophers of education room for disagreement is what form the preparation of students should take. It has been generally thought that education should foster dispositions that are regarded as morally unobjectionable. In ancient Greek thought ***paidea*** or education was often seen as the teaching of ***arete*** or excellence (Frankena, 1973:75). Plato, probably in contradistinction to the Sophists, proposed a normative theory that makes it the business of education to reform conventional morality in the direction of the good (Price, 1967:231). In Christian times, St. Augustine regarded the ultimate objective of education as conversion and repentance. Likewise, from Pestalozzi, to Froebel, to John Dewey education was seen as central to the preservation of social values and ideals.

In ***Democracy and Education*** (1966) Dewey defined education as "that reconstruction or reorganization of experience which adds to the meaning of experience, and increases ability to direct the course of subsequent experience" (1928:382). From his desideratum in ***The School and Society*** (1989) that "what the best and wisest parent wants for his own child, that must the community want for all its children," it becomes clear that for Dewey education serves its function best when operating in a climate of social harmony (1928:401). In Dewey we have occasion to realize that a philosophy of education is generally inextricable from a political philosophy. One's view of what ought to take place in the classroom normally corresponds to one's view of how society should function. Dewey's ideas on education find a direct correspondence in his understanding of American democracy.

More than the ideas of the philosophers, however, what has historically shaped the nature of education in societies such as ours has been the concrete needs of the social order. We are not in the European Middle Ages, a time when issues pertaining to the salvation of the soul seem to have been first and foremost in the minds of educators. We are in a late 20th century technologically advanced society. Education in our time and place suffers the pressure of a "technological economy" which "seeks to fashion the institution of higher learning as an antechamber for its manpower demands and as a source of marketable technological innovation" (Halsey, 1968:530).

Our community colleges in particular are highly susceptible to the pressure of the technological economy. In the City University of New York, for instance, since the advent of open admissions in the 1960's, ethnic minorities and people from the lowest socio-economic ranks of our society have increasingly become a very large percentage of the student population. These students come to our campuses lured by the traditional view of higher education as a viable means for the members of the lower classes to achieve the kind of social mobility that our democratic society presumably allows. Education in the minds of many students and teachers has become synonymous with training for a job. One need only look at the career-oriented curricula of most CUNY community colleges to ascertain the degree to which our schools are committed to the idea of getting students ready for the job market. Here higher education has become attuned to the needs of industry in a technologically advanced society that operates in accordance with the dynamics and principles of the capitalist economic order. Our kind of society

"turns education into a talent farm, a massive 'people processing' enterprise preparing manpower to the specifications of occupational demands and governmental blueprint" (Clark, 1968:513).

My own humanistic bias conditions me to see a fundamental fault with this arrangement. For me, even a job-to be worth having--ought to contribute to enhance my sense of humanity. Paulo Freire would contend that the purpose of our very existence is to become more fully human (1986). Nobody, at any rate, would find it difficult to accept that human beings have emotional, psychological, and intellectual needs which cannot be satisfied with the mere possession of a job. I believe that when the experience of education is so tailored after occupational demand and its meaning is circumscribed to the bare reality of a 9 to 5 schedule, the richness and complexity of the business of living is overlooked. For life does continue after the working shift ends.

In addition, when college means no more than a place where students come to acquire skills that will enable them to get a job, it becomes extremely difficult to make them see the relevance of "unrelated" subjects. Literature, foreign languages, philosophy, the social sciences, art and music, and the natural sciences will probably have no immediate bearing on their career orientation and will most likely seem irrelevant to students in our community colleges. Teachers are often at a loss for an answer to such questions as: "why should I read about what people were doing hundreds of years ago? I just want to be a secretary." This question, coming most likely from one of our befuddled students, is entirely logical and justified because this student was probably recruited by the given college on the basis of the promise of a good job upon graduation. Teachers would not normally be able to answer such questions with any degree of honesty and depth unless they are willing to say things that go counter to the selling pitch of their institutions.

It is no wonder that education is in such a dismal condition in our society today. In 1986 the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the National Commission on the Role and Future of State Colleges and Universities coincided in finding our campuses in the midst of very serious trouble. Gary E. Miller's summary of the latter's findings reads like this: "Among the warning signs noted by the commission are an increase in the high school drop out rate, a decade-long decline in minority students as a percentage of the total college population, growing adult illiteracy, a growing 'underclass' of the children who live in poverty, cutbacks in remedial programs, increased college costs, shortages of teachers, and poor understanding by college students of international issues." (Miller, 1988:2).

Most people agree with the veracity of the above scenario, and current bibliography on education is replete with statements aimed at explaining the root of the problem. There are those like Jerry G. Groff who find that faculty are to blame because their emphasis on specialization has "fostered a narrowness of vision" (Groff, 1983:xv). E. D. Hirsch points his bony finger to indignation to "a fragmented curriculum based on faulty theories" for the fact that "children from poor and illiterate homes tend to remain poor and illiterate" (1987:xiii). Alan Bloom accuses the liberal ideas permeating the curriculum and, in reactionary desperation, voices his nostalgia for the atmosphere recreated in Plato's ***Symposium***, a setting in which a group of males would sit around drinking wine and delighting in the pleasure of learned conversation--against the distant background of the lower social classes, the slaves, and the women that made such a luxury possible--in 4 century B. C. Athens (1987:381). There are also those like James Ryan who seem to blame open admissions for the whole affair (1988:17). And just as there are those who react by denouncing problems, some earnestly seek solutions in improving teaching techniques. The creative incorporation of the "module" and the application of "affective objectives" are two recommendations from community college teachers that come readily to mind (Gidding, 1987:29; Withers, 1987:21).

But I would like to explore the following question. What if the currently dismal state of affairs is normal? I mean, one could conjecture that this is a direct and desirable result of the capitalist dynamic. We know that value in the capitalist order of things is generally reduced to exchange value. There seems to be no reason, then, why our students should be interested in things that have no immediately discernible utility. Besides, the typical jobs that community colleges train students for do not really require much in terms of intellectual depth. Maybe we are

really producing the kinds of students our society needs. How would our consumer society fare with a population filled with thinking beings?

Eric Fromm reminds us that a society creates the kinds of people it needs, that is, people who feel they ***want*** to do the things that society ***requires*** them to do (Fromm, 1984:406). A capitalist consumer society needs students who think of human values in terms of exchange value and who seek satisfaction for their needs in the realm of consumption. It also needs teachers who share that worldview and are thus able to instill it in the minds of students. In this respect, teachers in our community colleges who presume to be preparing students for a better life out there could actually be seen as serving as soldiers of the economic order. Regardless of how we choose to define our job, it could be that what is required of us is that we create a pool of workers from which the market could choose freely to fill low status positions in the service sector of the economy. If we are successful, we service the needs of industry and help to keep students off the welfare lines. They may even see themselves as potentially moving upward in the social ladder, thus consolidating their faith in the capitalist economic order. Everyone would be satisfied. Our colleges would perpetuate themselves, and we would keep our jobs. There would seem to be nothing wrong with doing what our society has trained us to do.

What needs to be questioned, though, is whether the promise of a job for our students is one that can be kept. The implication of the promise would be that in our society a job is available for everyone who is able and willing to do one. Such an implication would seem to insinuate a distorted notion of the nature of capitalism. Students of the structure of capitalism would argue that among the fundamental laws of the capitalist economic order are the expulsion and attraction of workers as well as the creation of a labor reserve army. The most cursory glance at the dynamics of capitalism would reveal that profit, or capital accumulation as social scientists call it, occurs most effectively when those who control the means of production manage to reduce the cost of labor. Sometimes the only way to reduce it is by using fewer and fewer hands, something that automation quite often makes possible. In that respect, unemployment, which is often presented as a problem our society is currently facing, is really an integral and normal feature of our economic order. But, in reality, the idea that all those students who successfully complete their community college education will touch base with the job that is awaiting them outside of the campus is inconsistent with the nature of our economic structure. The idea contains a measure of deception.

The dimension of this deception becomes significantly greater when our students are minority students such as Blacks and Hispanics. A professor of Education from the University of California, Julia Wrigley, wrote in 1982 that during the 1970s the employment prospects of blacks "worsened absolutely and relative to whites" (1982:226). Her research shows that "the unemployment situation to black teenagers and young adults show unemployment rates... that are extreme even by the standards of the Great Depression". Even more disturbingly, she affirms, "the proportion of black men who are in the labor force has declined substantially, far more than can be explained by the rising enrollment of blacks in school" (1982:226-227). A recent report by Frank Bonilla, director of the Center for Puerto Rican Studies, would indicate that among Hispanics too a greater access to higher education has not proportionately led to more jobs or to an ascent in socio-economic status (1988).

What the findings of these scholars tell us is that the long-held belief that education provided an infallible vehicle for the less empowered sectors of the population to share in the benefits of the larger society seems to have fallen into disrepute. Education, it appears, no longer constitutes the passport to the American Dream for minorities. We can no longer guarantee that those students who graduate will find jobs or that, if they do, those jobs will be at a level higher than the lower echelons of the service sector, with only a slim prospect for upward mobility. Nor can we guarantee that the majority of those who enroll in our classes will successfully complete their education. Despite all our efforts at student retention students simply slip through our fingers in scandalous numbers.

Since we all need jobs, and many of us even enjoy teaching, I would like to propose an approach to teaching that recognizes the futility of its predicament. Teachers have no direct control of the job market nor of the oppressive social dynamics of class and race that shape the destiny of the majority of our students in the CUNY community colleges. But they have control over their own attitude toward the aforementioned social dynamics. They can choose to deceive or not to deceive their students in regards to the felicity of our social order. Teaching is not a neutral activity. When one teaches one takes a side. When one teaches one assumes a position with regards to the population one serves and the social structure within which the teaching occurs. Teachers should come to terms with the contingent nature of their jobs.

Here is where general education can help. For, in light of the precarious situation of the job market for minorities, it may well be that the only thing we can probably do to help them improve their lot is to help our students understand their social condition. General education which through the integration of the humanities, the social sciences, the arts, and the natural sciences seeks to provide individuals with the necessary instruction to enable them "to live 'effectively'" both within themselves and in society (Westbury, 1988:173), can equip students with the intellectual tools that would enable them to analyze their society critically and to discover for themselves what they can do to change the world they live in. General education and conscientious teachers can help our students to see the political nature of their condition.

Those who teach the disinherited cannot come into the classroom with the same assumptions of those who teach the natural heirs of the power structure. Aristotle knew very well that education should be relative to the political constitution of the state and logically conceived of very different kinds of education for freemen, slaves, workers, and women (Frankena, 1973:83). Certainly when he was tutoring the young Alexander, he had to keep in mind that he was contributing to the formation of a future king. Our students are not future kings. In most cases they are individuals fighting against social circumstances that threaten to make them future welfare recipients. We, in turn, must respond to their needs in ***radical*** ways, in ways, that is, that prod into the very ***root*** of their problems.

General education scholars seem to agree on the social intentionally of this form of instruction. Alan C. Purves defines the field as "the purposeful attempt to provide a particular group of students with a common core of knowledge, skills, and values." (Purves, 1988:1) And Gary E. Miller concurs in calling it a "self-conscious" field (1988:186). It appears that by its very nature general education is best prepared to address the needs of our students. The education they need is one that in the words of Chancellor Murphy "produces a number of people who come to understand that their economic and social condition is a function of definable and controllable forces not of fortune, destiny or their personal shortcomings" (Allan, 1988/1989:60). What they need, in other words, is to be able to look critically at the world they live in. They need what is often referred to as critical thinking.

Only critical thinking, which general education, because of the breath and scope of its approach, is best equipped to provide, can really empower our students. Roberta Matthews in recounting her experience with a social history project at LaGuardia reports on the use in the classroom of the "recollections and writings by the unsung heroes and ordinary people who shaped our country", and she does well in calling it "a curriculum of empowerment" (1988/1989:35,37). For empowerment is not the ability to qualify for a job. It is an understanding that affects the way one sees the world. When students learn that history is made by regular human beings--not only Carlyle's heroes or Churchill's generals--they become empowered with the revelation that they too have a potential for transforming the world they live in. The chance that they will do something to modify the society that oppresses them becomes automatically greater.

Ultimately, however, the teacher must make a serious decision: to take either the side of the oppressed or that of the oppressive system. For critical thinking is not a course that one takes or teaches. It is an attitude one assumes with respect to the world one lives in. It is not a skill. It is an outlook. It is not taught. It is transmitted. The transmission of "prejudices and biases" from

teacher to students, a colleague of mine suggests, is inevitable. Therefore, teachers must become aware of the theoretical framework informing their teaching. Teachers will automatically wield the dominant discourse of the ***status quo*** unless they consciously choose "to use the classroom to subvert its very function and help minority students to become producers of an effective counterdiscourse" (Villanueva, 1988-1989:57). For "critical thinking skills can be developed in students only by teachers who are themselves critical thinkers. If teachers are not themselves critical thinkers willing to challenge the system within which they operate, they are unlikely to encourage their students to critically analyze, and creatively resolve problems" (Cummins, 1989:30).

Students who are able to feel that the fact that less than 1% of American families own 80% of all publicly held industrial stock affects them at the personal level (Bowers, 1974:50); students who understand that racism is not a component of human nature, but that it comes after the economic viability of race oppression has been established; students who are able to see that there is a Native American side to the story of the settlement of the West; students who understand that when they are drafted and asked to invade a foreign country to defend the cause of freedom abroad they may very well be defending the cause of certain multinational corporations; students who are able to dissect the social, structural factors in their immediate world that may make it possible or impossible--on the basis of class origin, race, and gender--for them to realize their human potential; students like these would be by far more empowered than those who, equipped with a community college diploma and a blind faith in the fairness of the capitalist economic order, enter their low status jobs in the service sector with the hope that in due time they will ascend the social ladder and achieve the American Dream. Teachers should seek to recognize towards which of these two ends they are working. They are free to follow one or the other road, but they must be conscious of their choice so that if they have to deceive their students, they at least do not end up deceiving themselves.

WORKS CITED

Allan, Tuzyline, "Teaching is Learning: The Experience of an Open Admission Instructor", *Community Review* (Vol. IX, nos. 1-2, Fall 1988/Spring 1989) 58-60.

Bloom, Allan D., *The Closing of the American Mind* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987).

Bonilla, Frank, Paper presented at the CUNY Graduate Center, December 1988.

Bowers, C. A., *Cultural Literacy for Freedom: An Existential Perspective on Teaching Curriculum and Policy* (Eugene, Oregon: Elan Publishers, 1974).

Clark, Burton R., "The Study of Educational Systems", in *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, Vol. 4, ed. by David L. Sills (New York: The Macmillan Company - The Free Press, 1968).

Cummins, James, "The Sanitized Curriculum: Educational Disempowerment in a Nation of Risk", in Danna M. Johnson and Duane H. Roen, eds., *Richness in Writing: Empowering ESL Students* (New York: Longman, 1989).

Dewey, John, *The Philosophy of John Dewey* (New York: Holt and Company, 1928).

Frankena, William, "Education", in Philip P. Weiner, ed., *Dictionary of the History of Ideas*, Vol. II New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1973).

Freire, Paulo, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, tr. Myra Bergman Ramos (New York: Continuum, 1986).

Fromm, Eric, "Our Way of Life Makes Us Miserable", in *The Holt Reader*, ed. by John Scarry and Sandra Scarry (New York: Holt, 1984).

Gidding, Louise, "The Module: A Promising Institutional Vehicle for College Teaching", *Community Review* (Vol. VII, no. 2, Spring 1987). 22-30

Groff, Jerry G., *General Education Today* (San Francisco: Jassey-Bass Publisher, 1983).

Halsey, A. H., "Educational Organization", in *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, Vol. 4, ed. by David L. Sills (New York: The MacMillan Company-The Free Press, 1968).

Hirsch, E. D., *Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1987).

Matthews, Roberta, "Social History and the Community College Student", *Community Review* (Vol. IX, nos. 1-2, Fall 1988/Spring 1989).

Miller, Gary E., *The Meaning of General Education: The Emergence of a Curriculum Paradigm* (New York: Teachers College, 1988).

Price, Kingsley, "History of Philosophy of Education" in Paul Edwards, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Vol. 5-6 (New York: Macmillan-The Free Press, 1967).

Purves, Alan C., "General Education and the Search for a Common Culture" in Ian Westbury and Alan C. Purves, eds., *Cultural Literacy and the Idea of General Education* (Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education, 1988).

Ryan, James D., "Down the Up Staircase: The Impact of Open Admission in the City University of New York on Community College Faculty", *Community Review* (Vol. VIII, no. 2, Spring 1988) 14-21.

Villanueva-Collado, Alfredo, "The Integration of Gender and Race into the Literature Curriculum" *Community Review* (Vol. IX, nos. 1-2, Fall 1988/Spring 1989) 53-57.

Westbury, Ian, "Who Can Be Taught What? General Education in the Secondary School" in Ian Westbury and Alan C. Purves, eds., *Cultural Lieteracy and the Idea of General Education* (Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education, 1988).

Withers, Doris C., "Affective Objectives for Natural Sciences in the Core Curriculum", *Community Review* (Vol. VII, no. 2, Spring 1987) 15-22.

Wrigley, Julia, "A Message of Marginality: Black Youth, Alienation and Unemployment" in Harry F. Silberman, ed., *Education and Work* (Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education, 1982).

INTERDISCIPLINARY GENERAL EDUCATION AT DAYTONA BEACH COMMUNITY COLLEGE

FRED ROBBINS, DAYTONA BEACH COMMUNITY COLLEGE

A recent study conducted at Daytona Beach Community College has revealed that the overall purpose, structure, and content of the general education curriculum have remained basically the same throughout the thirty year history of the college. The majority of courses in the general education curriculum at DBCC are offered as discipline-based survey courses. However, the college currently offers students the option of an interdisciplinary program which encompasses the areas of communication, cultural arts, biological and physical science, social science, and behavioral science.

This interdisciplinary program, called QUANTA, began in the Fall Semester of the 1983-84 academic year as a freshman year, team-taught, learning community. QUANTA was established by a group of faculty who were concerned about the problems they perceived in the general education curriculum: the fragmentation of courses, the narrow disciplinary approach, and the isolation experienced by both faculty and students. To address these problems, QUANTA was developed with these four specific goals:

1. To help students make connections between courses and to place their learning in perspective.
2. To overcome student and faculty isolation within the classroom.
3. To help the student develop as a "whole person."
4. To help the student develop critical thinking, reading, writing, and speaking skills.

QUANTA integrates three traditional college general education courses around themes so that students can see the relationship between subjects. The three faculty are involved in collaborative teaching, using a variety of active learning techniques. These techniques promote interaction among the students and faculty with the faculty generally playing the role of facilitators rather than lecturers. The students and faculty become partners in learning. This type of atmosphere leads to a true feeling of community and helps overcome the isolation which is usually experienced in the college classroom. As a result of their experience of community in QUANTA, students tend to become more involved in other activities at the college, thus enriching the culture of the community college as a whole.

Participating in a learning community helps the student develop as a whole person. Emphasis is placed on the affective as well as the cognitive areas. Students are encouraged to develop their skills in communication, leadership, teamwork, openmindedness, and creativity. In QUANTA there is as much emphasis placed on process as there is on content. The environment of active learning and group interaction requires the student to develop critical thinking and speaking skills. The interdisciplinary nature of the program requires critical reading and writing across the curriculum.

In the Fall of 1988, a second year was added to the QUANTA program. In contrast to the collaborative teaching model of the freshman year, the sophomore year involves three separate courses taught by individual teachers. This approach is modeled on the "cluster" format at LaGuardia Community College. Integration is accomplished by teachers designing their courses to correlate wherever possible. The primary focus for integration of course content is in the communications courses.

The design of the interdisciplinary program, using a team-teaching approach in the freshman year and providing separate but integrated courses in the sophomore year, helps students develop their ability to make connections and to place their learning in perspective: the specific outcomes sought by the majority of proponents of general education.

THE RED BOOK REVISITED: THE RELATIONSHIP OF GENERAL EDUCATION TO ISSUES OF EXCELLENCE AND EQUITY

EVAN S. DOBELLE, PRESIDENT, AND CAL KOLBE, MIDDLESEX COMMUNITY COLLEGE, BEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

The 1945 Report of the Harvard Committee, ***General Education in a Free Society***, remains deserving of serious attention, and it is perhaps even more timely today than when it was first published. If we had learned the lessons in this seminal and classic work, American education might not now be in its present unsatisfactory and insufficient state.

With a few minor allowances for usages and viewpoints pre-dating today's vocabulary in reference to class, race and gender, the Report implicitly addresses these areas of concern with deep sensitivity and with devotion to both the premises and promises of the democratic tradition as it is expressed by and dependent upon the quality and character of education in America. References to class discrimination in the Red Book are obliquely stated and there are virtually none regarding race and gender. Nevertheless, in its theoretical and prescriptive approach to general education as curriculum and philosophy; we can find the resolution of many problems associated with those particular aspects of American education and society.

The Committee that authored the Report addressed an audience well beyond the perimeters of Harvard Yard and educational issues that were already critical throughout the country at mid-point in the 20th century. These same issues remain unresolved and even more pressing in our schools and colleges today. They have a great deal to do with equity and excellence. Let us examine the implications of the Red Book's propositions and recommendations for the millions of students schooled in the United States over the 44 years since its publication.

One of its primary themes is that "...education for an informed responsible life in our society...has chiefly to do with...the question of common standards and common purposes."[1] That is a weighty question, indeed, for shared standards and purposes are not subjects or skills that can be taught. The Committee believed, however, that general education provided a way for American students to learn how to recognize and acknowledge them, and through their schooling, sustain the cultural cohesion essential to keeping democratic society functional.

By no means does this suggest rigid educational uniformity. The Red Book did not advocate the imposition of a single curriculum for high schools or for colleges; rather, general education was seen as combining

> fixity of aim with diversity in application...adapting it to the needs and intentions of different groups...taking on many different forms and yet representing in all its forms the common knowledge and the common values on which free society depends.[2]

The theme of commonality runs throughout the Red Book, a thread that shapes its argument and patterns its design.

It appears, retrospectively, that the Committee saw academic specialization as the major threat to the communal spirit; at the college level illustrated by early choice of fields of concentration, and in the high schools by the device of tracking students into discrete programs. Noting that specialized education historically had a utilitarian, occupational purpose, whereas liberal education was viewed as the province of aristocratic idlers, the Red Book authors sounded a cautionary alarm that resonates down the decades to the present day.

> The very prevalence and power of the demand for special training makes doubly clear the need for a concurrent, balancing force in general education.

> ...Even from the point of view of economic success, specialism has limitations...specializing makes for inflexibility in a world of fluid possibilities.[3]

Today's educators and employers verify the Committee's forebodings, and it is cold comfort to protest that curricular slackness has been a factor, along with narrow specialization—both contributed to the current disparity between educational preparation and workplace realities, to say nothing of the decline of cultural literacy. The accelerating pace of specialized study and training over the past four decades resulted in high school and college graduates with little in common outside their professions and trades, as well as deficiencies in areas of common learning and substantive knowledge evident even among those who presumably had received "a good education." Once the relationship of schooling to occupational advancement became an article of faith for Americans, the schools catered to that perception by instituting the theory and practice codified in the Cardinal Principles of the 1918 Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, out of which emerged the comprehensive high school. The economic emphasis which served to rationalize a minimum twelve years of schooling had, by the 1940s, completed a shift from the core curriculum to clearly differentiated tracks into which students were sorted and delivered to destinies labeled "college prep" (professional/managerial material), "commercial" (clerical-to-middle management trainees), and "vocational" (blue-collar candidates). Youngsters tracked into the low ability groups were assigned, ironically to the "general" course, where content and expectations were minimal. This internal system of separating students was compounded by the effects of residential and racial segregation.

The various waves of reform that have periodically washed over the secondary schools and the colleges have vastly expanded the number and variety of course offerings, attempting thereby to justify the notion that no matter how pluralistic the population, or how inequitably endowed—materially, intellectually or socially—the educational system had something for everyone, at suitably stratified levels, so that every student who stayed long enough could graduate and thus claim to having been educated. The spurious egalitarianism behind that claim was, and continues to be, pedagogically unsound because it is educationally purposeless. And, whether by intent or by default, high school and college curricula were structured in ways that inevitably tended to perpetuate barriers to class, racial and gender parity.

The Red Book authors devoted a chapter to "Problems of Diversity," in which they state the book's second theme: "the final purpose of all education is to improve the average and speed the able, while holding common goals before each."[4] This is where the Committee comes seriously to grips with the dilemma posed by "...the immense variation among students...the stubborn and crucial difference"[5] in aptitude, background and motivation represented by the vast and heterogeneous multitudes which the universal, free and compulsory system brought into the schools.

The educationist movement in the forefront during the 1940s had, as its name and its goal, "life adjustment." It also had the encouragement and support of the United States Office of Education. In a document titled "Life Adjustment for Every Youth," it was claimed that in the secondary schools of the period, 20% of the students were being prepared for college, 20% for skilled occupations, and the remaining 60% were "unfit for either of these programs and should be given education for life adjustment."[6] This low estimate of the learning potential of a majority of those in high school took root in the expanded curriculum design with a proliferation of trivial and unchallenging courses perceived by the life adjusters as suited to the "needs" of students who were "mainly children from unskilled and semi-skilled families...low incomes...and a poor cultural environment."[7] That quotation characterizes the prevailing view of the dominant educationist faction of the period. To quote again from "Life Adjustment for Every Youth," theirs was "a philosophy of education which places life values above acquisition of knowledge."[8] Concerns about how one is supposed to arrive at the former without benefit of exposure to the latter must surely have spurred the Harvard Committee on in its deliberations.

The Red Book authors did not conceive of knowledge as accumulated bits and pieces of inert information; one of their several definitions of education is that it is "...not merely the imparting of knowledge but the cultivation of certain aptitudes and attitudes..."[9] and that general education develops such characteristics of the student's mind. This qualitative approach suggested developing in the student a set of specific abilities, i.e., "to think effectively, to communicate thought, to make relevant judgments and to discriminate among values."[10] Those items make up an educator's wish list that most of us could agree upon as the ultimate objective of the classroom experience. And yet, to our chagrin, it remains an objective that continues to be elusive on anything like the scale that is required.

Taken one by one, these abilities are examined in detail by the Committee and related to areas of study within the general education curriculum, to form an interdisciplinary core in which the various course subjects reinforce each other, not altogether in terms of content, but through that "cultivation of aptitudes and attitudes" they considered essential to training young people in using their minds well.

They describe effective thinking, for example, as the capacity to think logically, "to discern a pattern of relationships,"[11] utilizing both analysis and imagination, both empirical and deductive reasoning, dealing with implications as well as facts. In this relational construct, they suggest, lessons in effective thinking are teachable and learnable in the natural and social sciences and the humanities.

They describe communication as four related skills: speaking and listening, writing and reading. (In our hyped-up, computerized and media-dependent day, there is something quite restorative in that pared-down list of requisites for the exchange of information.) And the authors make a point of how vital clear writing and speaking are in the ordinary as well as more esoteric instances. "What we have in mind," they note

> ...is the language of a businessman writing a plain and crisp letter,
> of a scientist making a report, of a citizen asking straight questions,
> of human beings arguing together on some matter of common interest.[12]

They describe the process of making relevant judgments as the application of theory to actuality; abstractions connected to experience. As to method, they recommend that the teacher "...relate theoretical content to the student's life at every feasible point, and...deliberately simulate in the classroom situations from life," adding that the teacher must also "be persistent in directing the attention of the student from the symbols to the things they symbolize."[13]

And finally, to their description of discrimination among values, where there is no equivocation or hedging about neutrality. The committee believed in education as a moral enterprise, that the building of a strong mind was equally an effort to build strong character. It must be admitted that the authors' views on exactly how schools should help shape the individual's value system is a bit fuzzy. Nevertheless, they make a good case for trying to incorporate the sense of proportion and objectivity needed to test one's values into the general education canon. In this section they write:

> The ability to discriminate...covers not only awareness of different kinds
> of value but...a sense of relative importance...It covers also much that is
> analogous to method in thinking; for example, the power to distinguish
> values truly known from values received only from opinion...[14]

The Committeemen were careful, however, to distinguish the separate spheres of moral instruction, stating that "the school's responsibility is less than that of the family in this field...there is danger in regarding the school as a modern Atlas to whom is entrusted the bearing

of the whole task of the formation of man."[15]

It is regrettable that the Red Book was more prophetic in its apprehensions than in its vision of what schools might become. Some observations made by contemporary education historian David Cohen are an apt commentary in that regard:

> The high schools...cope with many contrary visions of education by promising to pursue all of them...they have stunted the high schools' capacity to take all students seriously and blocked teachers' capacity to cultivate those qualities long valued in educated men and women—the ability to read well and critically, to write plainly and persuasively, and to reason clearly.[16]

The desired outcome that Cohen avers has not been achieved in American secondary schools (and that we would venture to assert is only partially arrived at in the colleges) is very much akin to the results sought by the Red Book authors: products of schooling who have learned how to think, communicate and reason clearly and effectively. Learners who were taken seriously, each one of them with the same degree of seriousness. This is where equity must begin, and the base on which a standard for excellence rests.

Taking the student seriously is at the heart of the general education proponents' argument; it is the crucial element in any classroom, for it is the signal from teacher to learner that the whole process is worthwhile; that each student is worthwhile; that the material is worthwhile. We in community colleges are particularly aware of the difference this kind of attitude and outlook make in our students' learning potential. We see it demonstrated whenever a teacher's faith in a student's capacity results in that student believing, often for the very first time, that he or she can, indeed, learn the furthermore, that it feels great! We also know, in a very particular way, that these kinds of peak learning experiences can happen in many different areas and levels of study, whether it be remedial reading or English as a Second Language, mathematics, expository writing, introductory psychology, or physics.

Our stock in trade is built on the premise that motivated students can and will achieve and excel, despite prior experience to the contrary, despite a lack of conventional or adequate preparation, and despite previous low expectations. There are two key terms here, two significant elements linking our down-to-earth purpose to the loftier, more abstract goals set in the Red Book—and elsewhere—for general education. They are motivation and expectancy. The majority of community college students have that motive force propelling them towards their individual objectives; they don't enroll for the football games or the keg parties. For the most part, what they "expect" is to "get ahead" in every literal ways—in a career, in a transfer—essentially, to improve themselves and their prospects.

Our function is to help them do that. But our motives and our expectations ideally extend beyond those reasonable but limited attainments, to an educational dimension that is broader and deeper than the marginally higher education signified by an associate degree or certificate awarded for completing a course of study specialized to a narrow utilitarian curriculum. Many of our community colleges are now (and have always) been strongly motivated to support and promote interdisciplinary and core subject studies, conveying to all incoming students the expectation that college level work is going to make them think in new and different ways, about new and different ideas, on a new and different scale of values. Clearly, the implicit message, the expectancy, is that we believe every student who enters has the capacity to do that kind of thinking.

The Red Book writers held that belief, and it is worth noting that they dealt with it most directly and fully in the chapter called "***Problems of Diversity***." They did not, it is is true, approach those problematic issues on grounds of class, ethnic, racial or gender distinctions. Rather, they concerned themselves with the accompanying and over-riding issues of access, opportunity and equity as these apply to individual abilities and interests. And to a "virtue" that

seems almost as quaint as the notion of virtuousness itself as a quality one might today attach to the endeavor of schooling, i.e., "the vastly important but equally obscure difference in will power and fidelity of purpose,"[17] without which, they assert

> ...Even the best intellectual gifts come to little and less than the best gifts may go far with it...Neither extreme privilege nor extreme lack of privilege seems conducive to it...it seems to have something to do with a combination of clear standards and hard but not impossible demands...Nowhere is the insight of a good teacher so indispensable as in holding students to their best and in setting for each work matched to both his gifts and his will... equal opportunity does not mean identical provisions for all. Rather, it means access for all to those avenues of education which match their gifts and interests. That obviously includes access to good schooling...for all young people...regardless of their means.[18]

There is little use in conjecturing how broadly the Harvard Committee may have interpreted the term "means," in this context. Are we to construe the usage as applying to socioeconomic status in today's pregnant vocabulary, or in a more Algerian mode, wherein the Cambridge professorate deemed any poor but honest lad endowed with brains and backbone deserving of a scholarship to Harvard? We speculate it is closer to the former and our predisposition in light of the Red Book's larger and more lasting message is to claim it doesn't matter now. If, in fact, there are tacit structural weaknesses in their argument for general education as regards the scope of inclusiveness, the blueprint they drew is nevertheless still sound enough to accommodate space for additional occupancy.

More than other institutions—legislative, judicial, social, or mercantile—our educational system from the primary grades to post-graduate level has historically been the locus of equal opportunity and affirmative action policies. Historically, too, the schools have been the stage on which our ideological rhetoric has been tested against exclusionary tendencies. With the ever-more-widespread assumption that higher education is an essential entry on a job-seeker's resume, the colleges and universities—and the community colleges in particular—joined the secondary schools in their zealous pursuit of curricular expansion at the risk of pedagogic soundness. This kind of over-compensatory response weakens the educative process and demeans the capacities of those engaged in it. While technically non-discriminatory, it too often becomes undiscriminating and of little intrinsic worth, especially to students who traditionally have been underserved.

The general education curriculum, we submit, can be a bulwark against declining standards, as well as the level ground on which class, racial, ethnic and gender biases do not thrive and, in fact are challenged and overcome. As a single example from personal experience, our college has instituted a Common Book program as part of Writing Across the Curriculum. Last year we read Huxley's ***Brave New World,*** and by year's end we'd had student participation relating to science and technology, feminism, political autonomy and totalitarianism, prejudicial attitudes in society, and more than one admission that, in spite of the griping about the book as required reading, the experience had made a lasting and positive impression. This year our common book is Maya Angelou's ***I Know Why the Caged Bird Sings*** and in conjunction with that, we brought Ms. Angelou to our campus. Talk about role models and exemplars! Our students saw before their eyes a Black American woman who personifies the generally educated individual, one who speaks and writes and thinks and acts with uncommon grace and precision, but who passionately urges us to believe that the literature and history she incorporates into her art is our common possession.

Less than a month ago, the National Endowment for the Humanities joined the swelling chorus of voices bewailing the sorry state of American college graduates' intellectual development—their knowledge deficit in the humanities matches their equally unprepossessing grasp of math and science. Statistical and anecdotal evidence tells us that these dismal showings on the part of our presumable best and brightest indicates a classless, multi-ethnic, multi-racial,

non-gender specific condition. Our students in the colleges and high schools—all of them—need more and better than narrowly specialized, unintegrated and cultureless curricula.

General education is not a panacea; a core program with interdisciplinary collaboration won't necessarily help us prevail economically over the Japanese any more than the New Math was what got us into the space race with the Soviet Union. As the Red Book observes, however, specialized education "...is competitive and looks directly to worldly success," while "...general education represents a force in the curriculum and ultimately in society, which is not in the main competitive."[19] But theirs is not a limiting, romantic vision of undifferentiated sharing of content and goals, for they saw in their proposed curriculum the truly meritocratic way for students to follow their individual proclivities, enriching society by "...freeing the full scope of people's native gifts."[20] That kind of freedom, they suggest, has always been demonstrated by

> The welling up of talent and energy which has historically accompanied the decline of privilege and the rise of submerged classes...a release of powers suppressed or dormant until then.[21]

The basis of support for general education is respect for the student, the assumption that young and adult learners, regardless of class, ethnic, racial or gender factors, have the capacity and willingness to become creative, critical thinkers whose studies have opened their eyes and minds beyond the point where a dollar sign is visible.

There are, of course, many ways of conceiving and implementing a general education curriculum, as we are engaged at this conference in discovering. One nicely detailed proposal appears in Arthur Cohen's and Florence Brawer's 1982 book, ***The American Community College*** in a chapter titled "Developing an Integrated Curriculum," which they summarize as

> ...the process of developing a framework on which to place knowledge stemming from various sources, of learning to think critically, develop values, understand traditions, respect diverse cultures and opinions and, most important, put that knowledge to use.[22]

Somewhere between the uncompromising rigors of Hutchins' classic grounded general education and E.D. Hirsch's superficial "extensive curriculum," there is surely a middle ground that is both realistic and respectable. It is our responsibility to map out a rationale and a method for community colleges to claim that ground and make it a fertile, flourishing territory, one where the Harvard Committee would feel very much at home and highly pleased to see their 1940s ideas so well adapted to the educational and social imperatives of the 1990s.

NOTES

11. The Committee on the Objectives of a General Education in a Free Society, Paul H. Buck, et. al., *General Education in a Free Society*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1945, p.4.

2. Ibid., pp. 57-58.

3. Ibid., p. 53.

4. Ibid., pp. 79-80.

6. Richard Hofstadter, *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life*, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1969, pp. 343-344, citations from "Life Adjustment Education for Every Youth," a publication issued by the Office of Education of the Federal Security Agency, Washington, n.d. [1948?].

7. Ibid., p. 344.

8. Ibid., p. 345.

9. Harvard Committee, Op. cit., p.64.

10. Ibid., p.65.

11. Ibid., p. 65,

12. Ibid., p. 69.

13. Ibid., p. 71.

14. Ibid., p. 71.

15. Ibid., p. 73.

16. Arthur G. Powell, Eleanor Farrar, David K. Cohen, *The Shopping Mall High School*, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1985, p. 308.

17. Harvard Committee, op. cit., p.85.

18. Ibid., p. 85.

19. Ibid., p. 97.

20. Ibid., p. 98.

21. Ibid., p. 81.

22. Florence B. Brawer and Arthur M. Cohen, *The American Community College*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1982, p. 312.

THE OSTRICH AND HER EGGS

JANE INGALLS, NANCY BEDFORD GERMANA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

The title--what is this about? The ostrich is a large, strong, swift bird, the largest living bird, standing nearly 8 feet tall and weighing as much as 345 pounds. It can not fly, but it is known for its speed, its long legs carrying it up to speeds of 40 miles per hour. Its speed and its keen eyesight help the ostrich escape from its enemies, mainly lions and men. It is pure fallacy that the ostrich buries its head in the sand when frightened. Instead, with its speed and powerful legs, the ostrich will strike out against his foes.

So, why the title and this conference? It caught your attention. Maybe there are some similarities between the ostrich and the faculty involvement in identifying the general education outcomes for students of Germanna Community College. When I prepared the abstract for this conference last spring, the image of an ostrich sitting patiently on a nest of eggs appeared as I considered the Germanna faculty's response to the state's mandate to get on with the assessment of the general education skills we knew we were offering our students. Yes, sitting, sitting, sitting. However, there's something you must know about these faculty members. They are dedicated to their students and to the mission of the community college. Their first priority is to teach. Almost half of the total faculty (35), opened the doors of the college 18 years ago. Germanna is situated on a grassy knoll beside the clear, cool waters of the Rapidan River, untouched by man and his shopping mall. Germanna remains the last frontier from the slowly encroaching suburbia expansion of northern Virginia. A school with 1200 FTEs, 35 full-time faculty, 65 adjunct faculty serving 8 rural counties and the city of Fredericksburg, a population totaling 220,140 and by the year 2000, the projected population will be 260,450, and 377,750 by 2030. The service region covers 2,461.5 square miles and is one of the largest in the VCCS. The service region is divided into an eastern and western sector. The eastern sector is located in the I-95 Corridor mid-way between Washington, D.C. and Richmond, the state capitol. Ground breaking for the first satellite campus in the more heavily populated eastern sector is imminent with occupancy expected January 1992.

So, there sit the faculty, nurturing their students with their knowledge, warmth, and care. What kind of a job are we doing?

In a student outcome assessment, we are asked to respond to three basic questions on general education at Germanna Community College: What is Germanna's definition of general education? What are the general education objectives for our students? How do we measure our students' achievement of these objectives?

In order to answer these questions, a subcommittee looked at the college's mission statement wherein the concept of general education is implied but not clearly expressed. General education objectives for our students were not listed. Since there were no objectives, we had nothing to measure. Since no one on the committee wanted this task to be a meaningless endeavor to the faculty at Germanna, faculty ownership of the definition and objectives of General Education became the pivotal concern along with awareness and input by students and counselors.

The subcommittee began to lead the faculty in defining general education at Germanna and identifying the general education objectives for our degree-seeking students. A Faculty meeting was held in January, 1989 where twenty-seven full-time faculty and several adjunct faculty participated enthusiastically in dialogue on the definition of and objectives of general education at Germanna and the implementation of its assessment. A survey of general education competencies was distributed to all full and part-time faculty and student service personnel in January requesting them to rank those competencies felt to be characteristics for a graduate of a degree program at Germanna to possess in order to meet general education outcomes.

In April, 1989, the general education subcommittee presented to the Curriculum Committee the faculty written definition of general education at Germanna and the six general education objectives with specific competencies.

The next tasks were to measure our students' achievement of these objectives and to enhance the faculty members' awareness of the general education objectives embedded in their courses. Committees made up of faculty are now involved in these tasks.

Business Management Technology and Nursing program graduates were surveyed in May concerning the six general education objectives. The results of the survey indicate that these graduates (13 Business, 19 Nursing, 3?) see their experiences at Germanna as contributing to meeting the general education objectives: communicating, solving problems, clarifying values, functioning within social institutions, using science and technology, and using the arts.

At the same time we have been talking about General Education, several faculty have also been working on a project that involves one general education objective--solving problems or helping our students learn to think critically. The objectives of assessment and of this Funds For Excellence Critical Thinking Project are one and the same: curriculum revision and refined pedagogy (better teaching). Ten Germanna faculty are involved in this two-year project along with faculty from Blue Ridge Community College and NOVA. They are reading about critical thinking and experimenting with teaching their students critical thinking skills. Their mission is to share their insights and enthusiasm with all the faculty, staff, and students at Germanna. A major challenge to these Germanna faculty will be discerning how to best continue the momentum of this project in bringing the college-wide faculty into awareness and "ownership" of the need to facilitate our students' critical thinking skills.

A unique faculty experience is evolving at Germanna where a core group of faculty are focusing on teaching critical thinking skills and the whole faculty are defining and measuring general education skills. It's a grassroot-type of experience where one faculty becomes a mentor for another faculty and the experience evolves. So the ostrich analogy appears again, the ostrich sitting patiently on its nest, nurturing its offspring with its warmth and caring. Although the ostrich appears large and awkward, its keen vision and agility will help it avoid danger. Faculty involvement on the grassroot level with "ownership" of the process will insure that our students are being afforded the opportunity to acquire the objectives of a general education.

THE NON-TRADITIONAL STUDENT, GENERAL EDUCATION AND THE LIBRARY RESOURCES CENTER

NGOZI AGBIM, LAGUARDIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE, CUNY

The Community College Library, like its parent institution has come a long way. It began in a very small way, actually as part of the school media system serving the first Junior College, organized in 1901 "as a two-year extension of Joliet Township High School" in Joliet, Illinois.1

It was not until about 1928 that both the Community College and its library became their own separate entity away from the high school. Rapid development ensued after that, culminating with a tremendous increase in the number of community colleges, each with its own library in the 1960's, 1970's and beyond. The community college library kept pace with this growth, striving always to support the goals and the objectives of the parent organization. The library support of the instructional programs is really its major reason for being.

Way back in the 1940's the librarian at Stephen's College in Columbia, Missouri "tried to bring about a closer relationship between library and classroom." At this time, a committee on the Library in General Education, yes, general education even then, stated that "the library should be the resource center of the college." This idea was further developed by Harriet Genung in 1953 when she described the Community College Library as the "heart of the college." 2

At the peak of its development, 1960's and 1970's, the Community College Library was renamed the LRC -- (Learning Resource Center) in keeping with the characteristic changes in its collections, functions and services.

With the inception of the open admission policy and the consequent influx of nontraditional culturally diversified students into the community college campus, the library is required to cater to the varied teaching/learning processes created by this phenomenon. So that today, a typical Learning Resources Center has become a constellation of various resources and services comprising: all forms of print and nonprint materials, computer-assisted instruction for individualized and small group work, classroom distribution of hardware and software programs, instructional materials design and development center, academic computing and faculty development laboratory, tutorial services, audio visual and microcomputer software previewing services, etc. etc. Needless to say, developing a center of this magnitude is both capital and labor intensive. The Learning Resources Center obviously absorbs a large piece of the institutional fiscal and personnel pie. And how well is this giant enterprise being utilized in the teaching/learning process? As community and other colleges around the nation engage in debates about how best to revive general education for the student body, professionals in both the LRC and the classroom must realize that the link between both camps is critical in the building of an educational chain of continuity.

Prof. John A. Lanning of the Chemistry Development of the University of Colorado, in 1987 stated that core curriculum courses have two distinct goals of integrating diverse educational backgrounds and providing elements for critical thinking. "Information literacy skills" he observed, "are essential to both goals. The library therefore should be a classroom for core curriculum courses." Prof. Lanning suggested, among other things, a form of library/classroom partnership involving "the development of a freshman/sophomore level course in general library skills taught in the library by librarians."3

At LaGuardia Community College, the LRC offers, as part of its instructional program, "LRC 102 - Information Strategies" a three-credit liberal arts elective course open to all students who have fulfilled their basic skills requirements. This course focuses on helping students learn how to use libraries and other information resources effectively and efficiently in order to solve academic, job related and or personal problems. They are led through carefully constructed

exercises, assignments and projects to analyze information needs, formulate knowledge of access to resources, evaluate and choose discriminatedly the appropriate material(s) from among the great wealth of data which characterize the current information age.

(LRC 102 course outline distributed)
(Also now available is five-minute color videotape for recruitment purposes made by Prof. Agbim's LRC 102 class in the Fall 1989 quarter.)

My own personal experience teaching this course, plus my observation of real positive, gratifying, learning attitude exhibited by students taking the course, prove beyond doubt that undergraduates, especially in the community college setting are able to utilize the generic research skills learned in a well designed library course to solve problems in their other academic pursuits. By the third week of the course and throughout the entire term, students were bringing information needs emanating from other courses in which they were enrolled, or even job-related problems and reaching solutions through library research. I was quite excited about this healthy state of affairs and strongly encouraged its continuity. Neither the traditional one-hour library lecture usually linked to the Freshman English Composition program nor the ubiquitous and woefully inadequate library "tours" can produce enough impetus for students to think critically and make desired connections between disciplines.

Usually when faculty in the community college hear of library research, they immediately think of term papers and wonder, justifiably so, how to juggle the grading of numerous research papers with the committee assignments and other requirements of the busy college environment. Library assignments can certainly take other forms depending on the course or program involved.

At Hudson Valley Community College in Troy, N.Y., the library/classroom alliance takes the form of creating library assignments aimed at integrating the general education concepts such as: critical thinking, analytical and research skills into the course work across the curriculum.

"Pedagogically, a library assignment gives the students a chance to work at their own pace, in contrast to the hour exam, and to work essentially with a contract with the professor, with an understanding of how much and what quality of work is required. Library assignments reach both the weak and the strong students, giving the less able student a chance to manipulate unfamiliar concepts and challenging the bright student to go off on an independent tangent, each student working within his/her own learning style. By introducing students to the professional literature in their field we help them to learn independently, to know how to keep up with developments in rapid changing fields..."4

Course-integrated library assignments may result in class debates or formal class presentations by individuals or groups of students.

Susan Blandy has described a situation at Hudson Valley in which students in a science class were asked to research an aspect of energy source such as petroleum, biomas, etc. noting its advantages, disadvantages, cost, availability, effects on the environment, future potential, and so on. Bibliographic instruction classes prepared and delivered to these students, enable them to prepare written reports about the advantages and disadvantages of the chosen source, and then participate in a class debate about energy sources.5

Similarly at LaGuardia, I recall a presidential election year, a few years ago. A political science instructor and a reference librarian organized several lunch hour debates on issues raised by the presidential candidates. The debates ended with the political science class and other student spectators holding a simulated election for the presidential candidates.

Other excellent examples of library/classroom cooperation are available in academic library and higher education literature then there is time for discussion here. All that matters is that community college educators realize that the link between library faculty and classroom faculty is critical in the building of an educational chain of continuity. As the core of any core curriculum,

the library is central to academic effort, and any attempt to give students a liberal education, includes, by definition, intelligent use of the library.

The library is not simply a resource in which the universal varieties are to be found, but the exemplification of access to those varieties from many different perspectives. However, the very "connectedness" that "general" educators aspire to communicate to students can give way to fragmentation in the execution of a disjointed approach to use of the library.

Students may have received a brief lecture on library research as part of the English Composition I course. They may even have had a follow-up research session in the library, with the classroom instructor close at hand. However, without substantial coordination between the classroom instructor and the librarian, many students set sail on an uncharted sea of information, while their instructors are mistakenly confident that they won't fall off the end of the earth, simply because the earth is round. Some simply sail in circles forever.

This is not a well-rounded education, but a well-traveled one.

In conclusion, I suggest that whether we think of general education as a core curriculum or a way of thinking and behaving, or the four or five C's plus health as discussed this morning, the Learning Resources Center stands as a power house of knowledge which faculty should tap, to provide the much needed link and desired connectedness of academic concepts.

In the words of Doris Gruger Dole, the library exists, "because we recognize that no introduction to a field of knowledge is complete without introduction in how to proceed beyond that introduction on ones own. What the students learn today can never be all they will ever need to know. For most of their lives, there will be no teacher present to fill those needs. The world is evolving, knowledge is expanding and the best education we can provide students is the ability to cope with rapid change. It is the most important thing they can learn in the college and only the library can provide it."

REFERENCES

1. Doris Cruger Dole, "The Learning Resource Center's Role in the Community College System," *College and Research Libraries* 49:233 (May 1988).

2. Ibid.

3. John A. Lanning, "The Library-Faculty Partnership in Curriculum Development," *College and Research Library News* :8 (January 1988).

4. Susan Griswold Blandy, "Building Alliances: General Education and Library Skills in a Community College," *Integrating Library Skills into the General Education Curriculum*,Ed. Maureen Pastime and Bill Katz. New York: Haworth Press, 1989. pp. 62-63.

5. Ibid. p. 71.

6. Doris Gruger Dole, p. 237.

THE IMAGE OF THE OTHER: MEDIA SUPPORT FOR A PLURALISTIC CURRICULUM

LOUISE SPAIN, LAGUARDIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

We've all heard, and perhaps said, a great deal about integrating pluralism into the general education curriculum. In fact, the CUNY Board of Trustees has required that each campus "develop a specific, local plan to confront racism and promote pluralism." In referring to this "special mandate for community colleges to break down barriers based on race, sex, cultural background, age, sexual preference or other artificial differences," President Raymond C. Bowen, the new president of LaGuardia Community College, in his Opening Sessions Address on September 18, 1989, remarked that "there is a need to take a good look at ourselves as an institution committed to cultural pluralism to ensure that the notion not only becomes embedded in the different curriculums that we offer but also form the basis of our own behavior as educational leaders."

Many of your own institutions are probably undergoing the same kind of self-analysis and re-evaluation. In the model of the partnership just described by my chief librarian, I expect to be asked to play a significant role in "embedding the notion of cultural pluralism" into the different curricula. How will this happen? Instructors will be looking to the library to provide materials which support the concept of a pluralistic curriculum. As the media librarian, I will recommend audiovisual materials on a wide range of sub-topics, such as those included on the attached mediagraphy.

Here are listed some of the concepts and topics which I foresee will be requested and used. Instructors will find the visual imagery of media to be a particularly viable way of enabling students to examine and explore other cultures, breaking down the barriers alluded to by President Bowen by revealing the humanity of the "other." I heard a student leader describe how some LaGuardia students were very disturbed over the recent formation of a Gay and Lesbian Club which now meets at the college. They complained to her, and she took some of them by the hand and opened the door to the room in which the group was meeting. "See?" she said. "They're human." The visual element helps the other to become ourselves.

I'd like to show some excerpts from a few of the programs that are on this list, and if time allows, ask how you think they might be used to support your instructional objectives. While you watch, think of the concepts which are sometimes difficult to convey in class, but could be used to stimulate discussions through a media presentation.

A filmstrip called THE DISTORTED IMAGE is a good way for me to illustrate the double concept which I am here to try to convey, that visual imagery is a powerful educational tool, but it has also been used to mold public opinion, foster stereotypes and manipulate thought. By exposing these stereotypes, media material can serve as a kind of consciousness-raising which helps students to explore their own deep-seated prejudices or fear of the other.

The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith compiled a series of historic images from American newspapers, magazines, art objects and ads from 1850-1922 in THE DISTORTED IMAGE. It shows how stereotyped images formed harmful popular views of Blacks, Italians, Jews, and others, in the American consciousness. (Excerpt--THE DISTORTED IMAGE: STEREOTYPE AND CARICATURE IN POPULAR AMERICAN GRAPHICS 1850-1922, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 30 min. filmstrip).

One of the groups most maligned by stereotyping throughout the history of the last 200 years has been black Americans. A documentary called ETHNIC NOTIONS shows how caricatures in art and film were used to create an image of the Sambo -- a lazy, shiftless, pleasure-loving Negro; the Coon -- a dandy or buffoon who entertained by imitating his white betters; and the Mammy -- fat, black, obedient, docile, loyal, protective of the white masters and stripped of any

sexual allure. The tape gives a sociological and historical analysis of these roles, and how they changed after emancipation to the image of blacks as brutes: ravishing white virgins in such films as THE BIRTH OF A NATION, in order to justify violence against blacks. Here we see how these images were devised and what resulted from them. (Excerpt: ETHNIC NOTIONS, California Newsreel, 1987, 56 min. video).

Another group which has experienced discrimination simply by falling into the category of the "other" is the gay and lesbian community. In 1986, the New York City Council held hearings on a bill which proposed to eliminate discrimination in housing based on sexual preference. The footage from the hearings was used in a tape called RIGHTS AND REACTIONS: LESBIAN AND GAY RIGHTS ON TRIAL, in which people speaking for or against the bill reveal the extent of their tolerance or their prejudice against homosexuals. Students who hold discriminatory views may be the ones for whom you figuratively have to hold the door open and say "See? They're human," by showing this tape. This segment shows some of the extreme points of view of religious leaders at the hearings. (Excerpt--RIGHTS AND REACTIONS: LESBIAN AND GAY RIGHTS ON TRIAL, Tapestry International, 1987, 56 min. video).

A few years ago, a speaker named Jean Kilbourne did a study of the image of women in advertising and found, not that you'll be surprised, that it was being manipulated and exploited in order to sell products, to men and women both. In KILLING US SOFTLY: ADVERTISING'S IMAGE OF WOMEN, she makes a convincing visual systhesis using hundreds of ads, and analyzes the psychology of how advertisers use sex, guilt, competitiveness, myths and stereotypes to achieve one main goal--to sell. (Excerpt--KILLING US SOFTLY: ADVERTISING'S IMAGE OF WOMEN, Cambridge Documentary Films, 1981, 33 min. film).

And to conclude, you might want to see an image of yourselves--at least in the eyes of the foreign students who appear in your classrooms. In COLD WATER, Boston University interviewed 13 students from 13 different countries to discuss their image of Americans. What they tell us is that we value privacy much more than other cultures, and are always rushed for time. We're very ignorant about other parts of the world, and more superficial in the friendships we form (the "hi, how are you" syndrome). Here's what they have to say about their view of how American students behave in the classroom, and what they think of you, their professors. (Excerpt--COLD WATER, intercultural Press Inc., 1988, 48 min. video).

There is a concept called "image-making"--you've heard it often in politics. But it happens everywhere, given the importance of visual information in our society, and it isn't always conscious, and it isn't always positive. We can use the same tool in the classroom-images--to expose some of the unconscious ways in which thinking has been manipulated and barriers have been formed. Media is one device to support the pluralistic curriculum that we have all made our goal.

With special thanks to:

Program Committee

Roberta Matthews
Arthur Greenberg
Audrey Harrigan
Sally Mettler
Ernest Nieratka
Dehlly Porras
Joanne Reitano
John Stevenson
Eleanor Q. Tignor

Proceedings/Facilities

Maria Cossio
William Grauer
Berthe Nehan
Meryl Sussman

Publicity Committee

Audrey Harrigan
John Appiah
Josephine Corso

Hospitality Committee

Sally Mettler
Andrew Berry
Dehlly Porras
Marie Sacino-Ehrlich
Rosemary Sclafani

Registration Committee

Avis Anderson
Donald Amaker
Audrey Harrigan
Cecilia Macheski
Martin Millman
Marian Rutledge
Barbara Svitlik

Audrey Harrigan and Roberta S. Matthews,
Conference Coordinators

Founded in 1979, the Community College General Education Association has sought to enrich dialogue and disseminate information on general education curriculum reform in the two-year college. CCGEA believes that well-conceived general education curricula are of critical importance to the community college mission, and that the general education discourse at the two-year college differs in important respects from those at the four-year colleges and universities. Through annual conferences, conference "proceedings," its newsletter, ***Common Knowledge***, and personal networking, CCGEA proposes to be a powerful and effective force for effective general education nationwide. CCGEA welcomes new members to the organization and it invites submission by colleagues of brief scholarly essays on general education issues and descriptions of community college practices.

Membership: Please make checks payable to:

CCGEA
c/o William Smith
Mohawk Valley Community College
Utica, NY 13501

Institutional -- $50.00*

Individual -- $20.00

(*Includes membership for two institutional designees)

Common Knowledge:

George Higginbottom
Broome Community College
P. O. Box 1017
Binghamton, NY 13902
(607) 771-5301

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges APR 19 1991